A DEFENCE OF THE LITVRGIE OF *The* Church *of* England, *OR,* *Booke of Common Prayer.*

In a Dialogue betweene { *NOVATVS,* AND *IRENÆVS.*

BY

Ambroſe Fiſher, ſometimes of TRINITIE Colledge in *CAMBRIDGE.*

Cœcorum mens oculatiſſima.

Teade him that neuer read; for, by this wiſe The Blinde leads thee to Church, who laſt thine eyes.

LONDON,
Printed by *W.S.* for *Robert Milbourne* in *Pauls* Church-yard at the ſigne of the Greyhound. 1630.

BRITISH MUSEUM

48

TO HIS MVCH HONOVRED FRIEND SIR *Robert Filmer*, Knight.

SIR,

IT was *your care* that preſerued this *Treatiſe*; and it will bee *your honour* that you haue preſerued it. From you I had it in *writing*; to you I returne it *printed*. Pitie that *hee*, who was depriued of *ſight* in his life, ſhould be depriued of the *light* of his *true-worth* after his death: Pitie that *he*, who (though his *eminent abilities* could not altogether bee

hid) liued in ſome obſcuritie, if not *vnregarded*, yet *vnrewarded*; ſhould (hauing left this *Monument* of his *Learning*, and *Loue* to *his* and *our* Deare Mother, the Engliſh Church) be vtterly forgotten as if ſhee neuer had brought forth ſuch a ſonne. I confeſſe, many of *Our Worthies* (and be they euer acknowledged and remembred with honour) haue, *by parts*, *vpon occaſions*, vindicated and iuſtified *Our Common Prayer Booke* againſt oppoſers, but a *through defence* thereof neuer met I withall before this.

It was conceiued in the *braine* and *breſt* of this *learned Authour* in your Vncle *Argall's* houſe at *Colcheſter*, and the firſt draught thereof was there made. Perhaps the Laconicall breuitie thereof; the Socraticall diſputing, on *Irenæus* part; and the Ramiſticall *Dichotomies*, on the part of *Nouatus*, may perplexe ſome Reader, but queſtionleſſe to the *Learned*, as familiarly therewithall acquainted, they will be acceptable. To gather, and contriue *much* into a *little* was his *ordinarie*

course, and he was happie in it. It was his labour in like manner rather to speake to the *vnderstanding*, then to the *affections*, yet closely withall (in a *Crypticke Rhetoricke*) he moues them.

Brought vp hee was in his tender yeares among those, whom he here confutes, & by them was designed to vphold *the faction*. His conuersing with them (besides their Books printed) made himselfe acquainted with their *plots*, & *arguments*, and had wel-nigh framed him for *their purpose*: But the *Great-Ouer-Ruler* of all *plots* and *purposes*, gaue this *Blind-Man*, when he came to maturitie, *Inward-Light*, and drew him out of that *Schisme*, which euen with the *milke* was instilled into him, and vnder the *ferule* was pressed vpon him. It was his happinesse to come to *Cambridge*, and, in *Cambridge*, to that *Renowned Colledge* sacred to the *Sacred Trinitie*. There (as your selfe remembers) we were *coequalls* in time, and *companions* in *studies*. There attained he to the *knowledge* both of the *Tongues* and *Arts*; and improued them (by his *vndefatigable industrie*)

dustrie) euen almost to a *Miracle*. This *deepe-learned-man* was readie, euer-readie, to impart his knowledge, whether in Philosophie, or Diuinitie, freely, vnrestrainedly, cheerefully. To many young Schollers *there*, and at *Westminster* afterwards (where hee liued in my brother Doctor *Grant's* house) was hee a *lightsome Guide*, though his owne *eyes* were *darke*.

Knowledge and *Charitie* stroue in him which should exceed the other; so that his departure hence so soone, was a great losse to many, if I said to this *Whole Church* of *Ours*, I said but the truth.

It was his *Charitie* (grounded vpon *Knowledge*) that compiled this Dialogue. And the like *Charitie* excites me to draw it out of *obscuritie* into the *publique light* and view of the *Church*. And I am encouraged the rather hereunto by *His Maiesties* late *Blessed-Instructions* for the countenancing of the *to-much-neglected-Prayers*, and *despised Rits* of *Our Church*. This *occasion* iustly, mee thought, called for it; and would haue laid sacriledge to my

charge

charge had I with-held it. It attends on the *Scepter*; and *good ſucceſſe God* ſend it, that the *Publique Liturgie* of *Our Church* may hence-forth *iuſtly* bee *valued*, and *duely obſerued*. I confeſſe ingenuouſly, that it is *Catechizing* and *Preaching*, which enable vs to the *required performance* of *God's Worſhip*; but *Prayer* it is (eſpecially *Publique Prayer* in the *Houſe-Of-Prayer*) which is *God's-Immediate-Worſhip*. The more *Publique* this is, and the more *frequent*, the-more-likely (yea more then likely) is it to diuert iudgements, and draw downe bleſſings. And my *priuate Prayer* ſhall euer be, that *Publique Prayer* in *Our Church*, as it is *reuiued*, ſo it may be *continued* while the World continues, euen till *Our Ieſus* returnes in *glorie*. So prayes

Saint Barthol. Exchange,
London, April 5. 1630.

Yours in the *ſame Ieſus*,
who is euer the ſame

§ IOHN GRANT.

TO THE Reader.

WHat *Maſter* Fiſher *was, theſe three* Epitaphs *may further ſhow*: Two *in* Latine: *the* Laſt *in* Engliſh. *On his*-Marble (*in* Weſtminſter Great-Cloiſters, *neare the* Librarie) *they could not be engraued. This* Booke (*his* truer Monument) *may preſerue them too. The firſt* Latine One *was made*

that Honorable Knight Sir Robert Ayton, *then Secretarie to Queene* Anne, *and now to Queene* Mary: *The other by* D^r. Thory, *that Worthy* French Phyſician: *the* Engliſh *by a* True Louer, *and* Knower *of this Authour, Maſter* Iohn Harris, *ſometimes one of the* King's Schollers *in* Weſtminſter, *and afterwards of* Chriſt's Church *in* Oxford.

EPITAPH. I.

AMbroſius iacet hic *Piſcator*, cœperat hamo
Ambroſio piſces queis Deus eſca fuit:
Hoc & agens, vitam non lucem liquit, ab iſtâ
Annos vix natus quinque relictus erat:
Octo tamen vixit, non vidit, luſtra, nec vlli
Mens oculata magis, vitaue ſancta magis:
Hiſtoriæ, Sophiæ, Vatum ſacra abdita norat,
Norat *Adæ*, atq; *Remi*, & *Cecropis* ore loqui:
Et nunc eſt poſitus mutam propè Bibliothecam,
Ipſe loquens quoniam Bibliotheca fuit.

Niſi

EPITAPH. II.

Nisi lapis es,

AVdi, Viator, loquentem lapidem:
Hic cubat propter Ædem Sapientiæ,
Merito maior quam famâ,
Sapiens Immortalis Piscator.

Is, citò amissâ oculorum luce perspicacior,
Quantum homini fas est animo penetrauit
Omnis Diuinæ & Humanæ Scientiæ adyta.

Oculatis Cæcus facem prætulit:
Mundo mersos cœlesti radio ad Deum sustulit:
Generosæ Iuventutis quasi Parens:
Miserorum consolator:
Sui Dominus.

In terrâ extrà terram; auribus, ingenio intentus;
Deo, sibi, & Patriæ defæcato semper animo.
Idem vixit.

Tandem, nullo vnquam lucis ablatæ desiderio tactus,
Ætate integrâ, ex hac vitâ velut illustri nocte ad Patrum Luminum
Lubenter translatus, quod mortale fuit, tumulo,
Immortale sui desiderium bonis reliquit.

Gaudete cæci venict & vobis Dies.

EPITAPH. III.

Men, Women, Children, all that passe this way
Whether such as here *Walke*, or *Talke*, or *Play*,
Take notice of the Holy-Ground y'are on,
Least you prophane it with obliuion:
Remember, with *due sorrow*, that here lies
The-Learned-Fisher, Hee, whose darkned eyes
Gaue light (such as the *Mid-Day* emulates)
To either *Sexe*, each *Age*, and all *Estates*:
For, as on the *Full-Sea*, so on His-Brest
All-Vessels rode *All-Wayes* (He vnoppreſt
And deepe-enough for all:) *Men*, Old, or Young
Well or Ill-grounded; What Art or what Tongue
Soe're they durſt profesſe, hearing his name
Blusht, here return'd to schoole, and t'was no shame:
By *Lectures* of faire vertue, by discourse
Rich, sacred, and well couch'd, he adding force
(Faire Dames) to your Great Beautie, yet his debter,
Sweetned your sweets, and made your goodnesse better.
The *Little Wantons* made their *Mothers* weepe
To see their forwardnesse, so could they keepe
The *Blind-Man's* pow'rfull *Formes*; for by their lookes,
They knew their letters ere they knew their Bookes;
So rare his *Methods* were, so sweet so free
The *Nurses* milke was not so good as Hee;
For all the *Learned Tongues*, *Philosophie*,
All *Humane-Arts*, *Poësie*, *Historie*,
They had beene Wonders *Singled*, had they bin
So full, as they met in this *Magazin*;
And for the *Great Theologie*, iust fame
Gaue him all th' *Art* and *Power* of his ¶ *Name.*
Now, if that any *Tongues*, or any *Arts*,
Goodnesse, or *Vertue's losse*, may pierce our hearts,
Why should these *marbles* weepe alone? In you,
Reader, t'is sacrilege not to weepe too:
Sigh's are but *Rites*, a *Punctuall-Sacrifice*
And *Voluntarie*, were not *Teares*, but *Eyes*;
And, twere a profitable losse to thee,
That thou might'st so become as *Blind* as Hee:
As for that *light* thou read'st these *cold lines* by,
Know t'is but *Enuie* keepes the *Sunne* so dry:
For t'is presum'd the *Day-Guide* could not loue him,
That saw so much *without him*, and *Aboue him.*

¶ *A Fisher of Men.*

A Table of the *Chapters* in generall, and *Contents* in Particular.

Of the first Booke.

Chap. I.

Generall arguments against the Liturgie, pag. 1.

THe salutation of *Bonum mane*, and Χαῖρε *p.* 1. The name of Christmas, *p.* 3. Our *Liturgie* no *Masse-booke*, *p.* 4. Preaching of Sermons not hindred by our *Liturgie*, nor the zeale of the people thereby quenched, *p.* 7.

Chap. II.

Of set Prayer imposed by men, and of subscription, pag. 9.

Of *Set Prayer*, *p.* 10. Of *Subscription* thereto, *p.* 12. Of things indifferent, *p.* 15.

Chap.

Chap. III.

Of Feasts, and Fasts, pag. 17.

Of appointing *Festiuals*, p. 17. Of dedicating them to creatures, *p.* 18. The names of *Moneths*, p. 20. *Saints* Dayes, *p.* 22. *Michael* the Archangell a creature, *p.* 23. The *Apostles Holy Dayes*, p. 27. The Children slaine by *Herod*, whether *Innocents*, p. 27. And how *Martyrs*, p. 28. Of *Set Fasts*, p. 29. Of *Lent*, p. 31. Of *Wednesdayes*, *Fridayes*, and *Saturdayes Fast*, p. 32.

Chap. IV.

Of Place; and Ornaments, pag. 32.

Whether *Churches*, abused to *Idolatrie*, ought to be destroyed? p. 33. Of *Vniuersities*, p. 34. The *Dedication* of *Churches*, p. 37. Of *Chancels*, ibid. Of the *Surplice*, p. 39.

Chap. V.

The Preface. Of the Common Prayers, pag. 43.

Of these words in the *Preface Inuitatorie* (*At what time so-euer, &c.*) p. 43. Of that (*saying after mee*) p. 45. The *Confession of Faith* repeated, *p.* 47.

Chap. VI.

Of the Lords Prayer, pag. 48.

Of repeating the *Lords Prayer*, p. 48. And omission of the *Doxologie*, p. 52.

Chap.

CHAP. VII.

Of short Prayers, pag.54.

Of *Short Prayers*, p.54. Of the word *Priest*, p.55 Of the *Peoples Responsals*, p.60. Of *Gloria Patri*, &c. *p.*61. Of those words among the *Responsals*, *(there is no other that fighteth for vs but onely thou O Lord)* p.63

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Letanie, p.65

Whether the *Letanie* want *Thanksgiuing?* p.65 Whether these words, *(By the Mysterie of thy holy incarnation, &c.)* be an *Oath*, or *Magicall Exorcisme?* p.67. Of that prayer, *That God would haue mercie vpon all men*, p.69. Whether we pray for the *Dead* in these words? *(Remember not the offences of our Fore-fathers)* p.70. Of that *(Illuminate all Bishops, &c.)* p.74. Of that *(from fornication, and all other deadly sinne)* p.76 Of the number of *Prayers* for *Temporall blessings*, p.79 Of *Lightning* & *Tempest*, p.83. Of sudaine death, *p.*84.

CHAP. IX,

Of Hymnes, p.86

Of *Musique* in *Churches*, p.86. Of *Magnificat*, *Benedictus*, *Nunc dimittis*, p.91. Of *Te Deum*, and *Benedicite*, p.92. Of that *(When thou hadst ouercome the sharpnesse, &c.)* p.93

Chap. X.

Of Collects, and Creeds, pag.93

Of those words in the *Collect (Grant that this day wee fall into no sinne)* p.94. Of those (in the power of the Maiestie to worship the Vnitie) *p.* 95. The tearme of *Penance*, p.96. Of *Chance*, p.97 No *merit* intimated in those words of the *Collect* vpon *Ashwednesday* (*that wee worthily lamenting our sinnes, &c.*) p.98. Nor despaire in those, in that *Collect* vpon the twelfth *Sunday* after *Trinitie Sunday*, and in that fift after the Offertorie, p.99 The often Rehearsall of the *Apostles*, *Nicene*, and *Athanasian Creed*, pag. 102, Of equalizing them to the *Canonicall Scripture*, ibid. of standing at the *Creed* rehearsed, *p.*103

Chap. XI.

Of God's speech in the Liturgie, p.104

Of omissions in the *Commandements*, p.104 Of the prayer vsed by the *People* betweene euery *Commandements*, p.108. Of the *Commination*, ibid. Of those words in the *Catechisme* (*redeemed me, and all mankind*) p.109

Chap. XII.

Of the Sacraments in generall: and of Baptisme, p.110

Of the two *Sacraments*, *generally necessarie to sal-*

ſalnation, pag.211. Of the *viſible ſigne*, 113. Of their neceſſitie to *ſalnation*, pag.115. Of thoſe words in *Baptiſme (vnleſſe a man be borne of water, &c.)* p.117. Of the *ſanctification* of water in *Baptiſme*, pag.125. Of *Godfathers*, pag.126. Of the naming of *Children*, pag.128. Of priuate *Baptiſme*, p.129. Of *Womens* baptizing, pag.131 Of conditionall *Baptiſme*, p.132

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Croſſe in Baptiſme, p.134

The *Croſſe in Baptiſme*, no breach of the *Commandements*, no *Idoll*, p.134. No *Idolothite*, p.142 As wee vſe it, there is no *Superſtition* in it, *p.*143 neither cauſe of *Scandall*, p.146

CHAP. XIV.

Of Confirmation, p.150

Of *Confirmation*, both in the ſigne thereof, *p.* 151. and grace thereby, p.152. Not preferred by vs before *Baptiſme*, p.154

CHAP. XV.

Of the Lords Supper, p.157

Of thoſe words (*leaſt after that holy Sacrament*, &c.) and whether *Iudas* receiued the *Lord's Supper*? p.157. Of *kneeling* at the *Communion*, p.160

CHAP. XVI.

Of the Viſitation of the Sicke, p.173.

Of the neceſſitie of the *Communion*, p.173. Of the *Communion* in priuate, *p.*174. Of *Abſolution* with authoritie, and to particular men applied, *p.*175

CHAP. XVII.

Of Matrimonie. p.177

Of the ſtrait charging of the parties to be married, *p.*177. The Oath *ex Officio*, p.178. Of the conſent of *Parents* before *Marriage*, p.179. Of errour in the *Perſon*, p.180. Of *Eunuchs*, *Hermaphrodites*, *Leproſie*, *Falling Sickneſſe*, *&c.* ibid. Of ſeperation by death, *p.*181. Of infidelitie, and adulterie, and how they make *ſeparation* after *Marriage*, p.182. Of thoſe words *(with my bodie I thee worſhip)* p 184. Whether Saint *Paul* were the Authour of the *Epiſtle to the Hebrewes*, p.185. Of asking *Banes* in the *Church*, pag.187. Of the *married parties kneeling before the Communion Table*, p.189. Of thoſe words *(conſecrated to ſuch a myſterie)* ibid. *Marriage* not acounted by vs *a Sacrament*, ibid. towards the end, and ſo to the end of the *Chapter*. Of the *Ring* in *Mariage*, p.195

CHAP. XVIII.

Of Churching: and Buriall, p.196

What *purification* is abrogated, *p.*196. & how, *p.*197. Our *Churching* of *Women*, no *Iudaiſme*, and of the *Vaile* then vſed, p.198. and of the *Offering* impoſed, *p.*199. Of *Tithes*, ibid. They are *God's Stipends*, not *Almes*, p.200. They are not *Iewiſhly* Ceremoniall, *p.*201. They are due to

Mi-

Miniſters, and ſo proued, *ibid.* Of *competencie*, p.204. *Citic Tithes*, p.205. The *Apoſtles* were not maintained by *Almes*, ibid. *Prieſts* bury not, but aſſiſt the *Funerall*, p.207. Of *Prayers* then vſed, and of *Sermons*, p.208. The place of *Burial*, p.209.

The ſecond Booke.

CHAP. I.

Of the Booke of Tobit, p.211

THe *Apocryphall* Bookes no *Canon* with vs for *Doctrine*, p.211. And yet, vpon good grounds, read in our *Church*, p. 212. As namely, for the explanation of the *Canonicall Scriptures*, p.215. Why they are called *Apocryphall*, pag.216. Of the Angell *Raphael*, in the Booke of *Tobit*, p.220. Of the ſeuen *Angels* in the twelfth Chapter of *Tobit*, p. 221. That number is neither *Magicall*, nor *Popiſh*, p.223. The Office of *Angels*, p.224. Whether they pray for vs? *p.*225. Whether the *Angels* eate really? *p.*227. Of the *Angels* ſpeaking, *p.* 228. Of *Aſmodeus*, the euill ſpirit, *p.*230. Of the *Nature of Angels*, both in their *Affection*, ibid. any limitation, in reſpect of the meanes, and manner, *p.*232. Of *Almes*, and how they purge ſin, *p.*235 Of *contract* before *Marriage*, p.237

CHAP.

Chap. II.

Of Iudeth : and the Song of the three Children, p.241

Of the word *Titans*, and of borrowing words from *Poets*, p.241. The time of *Iudeth's* Storie, *p.* 249. Of *Bethulia*, p 248. *Iudeth's* fasting, whether superstitious? *p.*249. Her *prayer* whether impure? *p.*251. Her craftè whether wicked, *p.*254. Her course is warranted by the like of *Iael*, in the Booke of *Iudges*, p,257. Of the *Song* called *Benedicite*, & the vse thereof, p.259. The clearing of that *Historicall Fragment* from obiections, *p.*260 The Storie of *Susanna* vindicated, *p.*262. The Storie of *Bel*, and the *Dragon* opened, *p.*264

Chap. III.

Of Wisdome : Ecclesiasticus, and Baruch, p.265

Of the Booke of *Wisdome's*, Authour, *p.*265 The explanation of those words (*But rather, being good, I came into an vndefiled body*) p.266. And of those (*when a Father mourneth grieuously for his Sonne, &c.* p.268. Of *Tammuz*, ibid. Of the Argument of *Ecclesiasticus*, p.269. Of the *Prologue*, p.270. Of the *Treatise*, p.272. How *Enoch* is said to be taken away, *p.*273. Of *Samuels* death foreshewed, *ibid.* Of *Elias*, pag. 274. Of the time when *Ierusalem* was burnt in *Baruch's* account, p.276. What he meanes by those words (*Heare the dead Israelites*) p.277. Of *Ieremies* Epistle, *p.* 278.

Chap.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Translation of the Psalmes, p.280

Of the *Psalmes-Tiles*, p.280. Of words detracted, *p.*283. The *sense* not corrupted in that 68. *Psalme, verse* 27. p.284. Nor in the 105. *vers.* 28. p.285. Of additions to the *Psalmes* in sentences, *p.*287. In words, 288. Of the obscuritie in translation (*or euer your pots bee made hote, &c.*) *p.*291 And of that (*humbly bringing pieces of siluer*, &c.) p.292. And of that (*it shall not breake my head*) *pag.*293. Of falshood in translation, as in that (*thou shalt learne frowardnesse*) pag.294. And in that *Psalme* 125. 3. (*shall not fall*) ibid. And in that *Psalme* 107. *verse* 40. (*though hee suffer them to bee euill intreated of Tyrants*) *ibidem*. And in that, *Psalme* 68. 6. (*Men of one minde*) *p.*295. And in that *Psalme* 75. 3. (*when I receiue the Congregation*) *ibid*. And in that (*then stood vp* Phinees *and prayed*) pag.296. And in that (*make mee to delight in good*) *ibid*.

CHAP. V.

Of the Lessons, Epistles, and Gospels. p.297.

Of the omission of Chapters, *p.*297. The terme of *Lesson*, p.299. Of that translation, *Luke* 1.36. (*this is the sixt moneth that is called barren*) ibid. Of cutting the *Bible* into *Epistles* and *Gospels*, p. 300. Of those words left out, *Col.*3.12. (*Holy and*

and beloued) p.301. Why we call *Prophecies, Epistles*, p.302. The place *Galat.*4.5. cleared *p.*303 How wee are the naturall sonnes of God, *ibid.* How *Paul* calleth *Timothy* his *naturall sonne*, ibid. God, in a different degree, loueth vs as his sonne *Christ*, ibid. *Iohn* 1.1. Cleared page 304. Of that *Gal.*4 25. *bordereth* for *answereth*, pag 305. Of that *Ephes.*3.5. (*Father of all that is called Father*) ibid. *Ephesians* 5.13. cleared, *p.*306. *Heb.*9.25. cleared, *ibid. Rom.*12.11. cleared, *pag.*307. *Luke* 1.48. cleared, *ibid.* 1.*Cor.*9.27. cleared, *ibid. Phil.*2.7. cleared *p.*308. 1.*Pet.*3.20. cleared, *ibid.*

A Dialogue concerning the Liturgie

OR

The Booke of Common Prayer.

The Speakers.

NOVATVS. *A curious Corrector, of things indifferent.*

IRENÆVS. *A peaceable Conformer to the state of the present Church.*

CHAP. I.

Generall arguments against the Liturgie.

1. GOod morrow to you friend Nouatus, how haue you fared this cold Christmas.

N. Brother *Irenaus*, as my body is in health: so my minde is ill apaid to heare your *good morrow*; sauouring of *Paganisme*

(being drawne from *Bonam mane*, vſed by the *Romans*) and your *Chriſtmas* of *Poperie*, which ioyneth *the Maſſe* to *Chriſt*, as *an Aſſe* to *an Oxe*; or *Dagon* to *Gods Arke*.

I. The Latine word mane properly ſeemeth to ſignifie nothing but gracious or peaceable: whence we tranſlate Manes, good ſpirits: and immanis Cruell. In which ſenſe if we interprete Bonum mane: it ſhall betoken nothing but grace or Peace be with you: which kind of ſalutation ſoundeth more of heauenly Scriptures, then of earthly heathens. But if mane be taken for the morning, as being the moſt gracious time of the day: wherein the brayne is Cooled: the ſtomacke ſtrengthened: the heart tempered: and the ſpirits repaired: How can this greeting of good morrow more diſpleaſe then haile, or χαῖρε vſed by [a] the Angell to the Virgine: which as it ſeemeth to be deduced from [b] χαῖρος, a ſeaſon: So before Luke vſed it, the heathens did vſurpe it. For Agylla (chiefe Citie of Hetruria) was called Cœre (as ſome thinke) of χαῖρε. which was vſed by a Citizen in ſcorne to a Pelaſgian beſieger, the ſame day the Citie was ſurpriſed.

a *Luke* 1.28.
b *Ionice* χ *pro* χ. *vt in* δῖ-καιος *ex* δίχα.

N. To let your *Latine* and *Poetry* paſſe: *praier* in common talke bewrayes little reverence. Againe we ought not to ſalute or pray with them, whoſe religion is to vs vnknowne. *Iohn* 10.

I. To let paſſe your hard Cenſures, by which

which you cut out the tongues of tongues: and plucke out the hearts of artes: Is there not a prayer expreſſt in the common talk of [c] Boaz and his reapers? Though the phraſe haile were abuſed by hypocriticall Iudas, and the prophane heard of the people, (which preferre their ſalutations before their ſaluations:) Can it not therefore with conuenient reuerence bee vſed by the Angell? Are not ſome ſudaine ciaculations, reuerent prayers? As for your Scripture it is wreſted. For Saint Iohn forbiddeth only familiar greetings of knowne heretiques. The ſame Apoſtle elſewhere, permitteth vs to pray for all, (except the [d] ſinners againſt the holy ghoſt.)

[c] *Ruth.* 2. 4.

[d] 1. *Iohn* 5. 16.

N. I eſteeme not what *you* ſpeake of *prayer*, who ſeeme to be ignorant of the meaning thereof: foraſmuch as *you* loue *the maſſe*, a fatall *enemy* to all *true prayer*. And this appeares not only, becauſe *you* familiarly name *Lammas*: *Michelmas*: *Chriſtmas*: *Candlemas*: But alſo becauſe (I take it) you haue there in your hand *an Engliſh Maſſe-booke*.

I. The Saxons vſed this word Mas, or Mes for a feaſt: in which ſenſe, theſe times are ſo termed by vs, without any imitation of the Popiſh maſſe. Now if you can proue that the booke of Common prayer is a Maſſe booke, I ſhall not be ſo backward as not to conſent: nor ſo froward as not to confeſſe the truth.

N. Firſt in generall I thus obiect againſt *your*

Liturgie: That which is taken out of *the Masse booke of the Pope*, who is *an Idolater*, *Antichrist*, and *out of the Church*: the same is to be reputed as *the Masse booke*. But *such is your Liturgie*. *Ergo, &c.*

I. I answer to your Maior: First, that the two former attributes which you ascribe to the Pope are impertinent: except your speech bee thus limited. That which is drawne from the Pope as he is an Idolater, &c. For else Saint [e] Paul and Saint Iames had erred in borrowing the speeches of heathenish and Idolatrous Poets.

N. But it is written [f] *thou shalt not doe so*: Therefore we may not pray as *Idolaters* doe.

I. If wee referre that precept to the fift verse: where the Hebrewes are forbidden to sacrifice elsewhere then at the Tabernacle: it is meerely Ceremoniall neither can bind vs: But if it bee referred to Images in the third verse, it is morall indeed, but forbiddeth only communion with idolaters in that wherein they are such, and not otherwise. For example kneeling in prayer before Iupiters image is forbidden. Heere simply and absolutely in prayer kneeling is not interdicted. For it is a Dictate of nature that kneeling is a gesture agreeable to Gods worship: But to doe this before the idoll of Iupiter (who was but a King, or is but a Planet, that is only prohibited as idolatrous.

e *Acts* 17.28. 1. *Cor.* 15.33. *Titus* 1.12. *Iames* 1.17.

f *Deut.* 12.4.

N. We

N. We ſhall diſpute more largely of the *particular obiections*, wherefore I proceed; *The Pope is Antichriſt: Therefore whatſoeuer is taken out of his Portuiſe, is Antichriſtian.*

I. This is not vnlike an argument of a certaine Arrian, confuted by Zanchius. The Trinity is Defended by the Pope who is Antichriſt, It is therefore Antichriſtian. In like manner wee might thus reaſon: The Turke (whom ſome count Anticbriſt, and all an Apoſtate) yea the Deuill acknowledgeth one God: The Pagans alſe beleeue that there is a God. To acknowledge therefore and beleeue theſe things is Turkiſh, Deuilliſh, Heatheniſh. In all theſe arguments there are the ſame g fallacians for ignorance of a limitation.

g *Ab accidente. A dicto ſimpliciter. Principij petitio non cauſa, &c.*

N. Antichriſt is an Arch-heretique, whatſoeuer therefore he maintaineth is hereticall.

I. To the old errour you adde a new, like Drunkeneſſe to thirſt; the old appeares in the Conſequence. For hereſie (as the Greeke word ſheweth) is a choice of ſome errour directly impugning the foundation of Religion. Now, where election is, there muſt needs be ſome refuſall, ſo that he which reuolteth from all points of truth, ceaſeth to be an heretique, and becommeth an Apoſtate, A Pagan, An Atheiſt: or ſome other monſter. Your new errour is in the antecedent, wherein you ſay that Antichriſt is a chiefe heretique: For antichriſtianitie conſiſteth not ſo much in errour, and he-

αἵρεσις ἀπὸ τῆς αἱρεῖν, to chooſe.

resie, as in tyranny ouer mens Consciences: to which it ioyneth things indifferent, as necessary to Saluation.

N. I am glad you haue swallowed this bait: For I shal hereafter proue by this definition that *your Seruice Booke* is *Antichristian:* Meane while tell me is *the Popes third attribute* (namely that he is *out of the Church*) impertinent also to the matter?

Better Catholique.

1. More pertinent, but lesse true: For though the Pope, were neither in nor of, the Catholique: yet certainly he is in the visible Church; As thus may appeare. First Antichrist (whom you take to be the Pope) sitteth in the Temple of God; that is, in the Church visible: Secondly, the Pope (by your confession) is an heretique. Now, that an heretique is in the Church, we know, both because none can be excommunicated but those that are within the Church. Neither will any deny that heretiques doe deserue excommunication. As also because heretiques, repenting after excommunication, are receiued into the bosome of the Church, without new Baptisme: which could not bee, if they were vtterly cut off from the Church. Thirdly no Baptisme can be out of the Church: But in the Popes iurisdiction is true baptisme, which by no meanes can be iterated, vnlesse there come some violent h spirit, which for haste will rebaptise himselfe. Not vnlike a frantque man, who though meate be present: yet, vpon pre-

h *Smith* at *Amsterdam.*

tence

tence of hunger, eateth the flesh of his owne arme. The Pope therefore remayneth within the territories of the visible Church. Hitherto of your Maior. Now to your Minor wee say. That wee extract our Liturgie, not from the loynes, or lines of the Pope, but from Gods Word, and the primitive Church: howsoeuer the Pope may seeme to haue vsed, or vsurped the same.

N. Let not him that putteth on *the Sword* boast as he that putteth it off: For I hope shortly to refell what you haue said. Now from *the Platforme* of your *Liturgie*, I come to treat of *the* i *end* and *purpose* thereof: which seemeth to be, first, the hindrance of *Preaching Sermons*.

i Second generall obiection: the Liturgie a Lethargie.

I. Proue that, and then raile your fill.

N. That, whose length is such, that it taketh from the Minister, both conueniencie of time, alacritie of minde, and strength of bodie, in regard of preaching; the end thereof is the hindrance of preaching: but such is your Liturgie: *Ergo.*

I. A cloud without raine. Your minor is vntrue: For first oftentimes the Preacher is not the same with the Reader: Especially in Catherall Churches and Chappels, as also where there is a Curat, or Coadiutor. Secondly, one of the Chapters is in many Churches read by the Clark. Thirdly, part of the Psalmes, and other answers, are dispatched by him and the people. Fourthly, the Commination; Letany,

ny, the Nicene and Athanasian Creedes, and diuers other things are not appointed at all times to be read. *Fiftly*, many things may be omitted at the Ministers discretion, according to times, places, persons, actions. By all which it appeareth that the Minister is not so much tired before hee begin to preach, as you pretend.

N. Instead of *medicines*, you reckon so many diseases: as shall hereafter appeare. Now *the second end* of *your Liturgie* is *to quench all zeale* in *the people* by the *wearisome prolixitie* thereof:

I. Your faction (so infamous for long prayers, vnder colour whereof widowes houses are deuoured) should in this point haue beene more silent. Againe the length of this dutie should breed a certaine reuerence in vulgar mindes, which vse to contemne those things that are passed ouer with perfunctory brevitie: Lastly, the variable delight which commeth by hearing, singing, answering, doth rather kindle, then wearie deuotion.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of ſet Prayer impoſed by men, and of ſubſcription.

N. IT followeth now: That wee produce thoſe ſpeciall *argu-ments* which impugne *the Li-turgie.* Which *Booke* is of *two ſorts. The old,* compilde in the dayes of *Edward the Sixt:* which *wanted the Pſalmes, Leſſons, Epiſtles,* and *Goſpels:* and *the new* compoſed in the dayes of *Queene Elizabeth,* and now eſtabliſhed.

I. Remember by the way, that you oppoſe your ſelfe not only to Religious Princes: but euen to the glorious Martyrs.

N. Princes and *Martyrs* might erre. And it may be that *Hooper,* and ſome *other Martyrs,* did afarre off deſcry *this land,* which now wee haue found out. Vpon whoſe *authoritie* notwithſtanding I rely not; but proceed to *the old Liturgie.* Wherein I will handle, *Firſt,* the *Circumſtances,* then *the Subſtance.* The *Circumſtances* are foure. Firſt, *the perſon inioyning.* Secondly, *time.* Thirdly, *place.* Fourthly, *Ornaments inioyned.* Concerning *the Perſon inioyning,* or *the authoritie thereof,* three *queſtions* may ſeeme to be moued: Firſt, *whether Prayer may be ſet?* Secondly, *whether it*

may be imposed by men? Thirdly, *whether Subscription may be yeilded thereunto?*

I. As in that which is called Parelius, though three Sunnes appeare, there is but one true Sunne; the other being only reflections thereof. So these questions three in appearance, are but one in substance. For if prayer may be set, it may be imposed by men. Neither may wee refuse to subscribe to that which authoritie doth lawfully impose.

N. Confound you the *questions* as you please. I will *first* thus argue against *Set Prayer. Euerie thing lawfull is commanded in the Scripture: Now; Set Prayer is not commanded.* Ergo.

I. Your Maior I thus oppose. Things indifferent are not commanded and yet lawfull: Some lawfull things therefore are not commanded.

N. I meane *things lawfull* in *Gods worship.*

I. To bring a Bible to the Church is not commanded. Neuertheless it is lawfull in Gods worship. *Ergo, &c.*

N. It is commanded not *Directly*, but by *Consequence:* as being *an helpe* to *Gods worship.*

I. To sit, or stand in Preaching is not commanded by the Consequence, and yet lawfull in Gods worship, as being vsed by Christ: *Ergo.* Besides your Minor failes. For Set Prayer is commanded. As appeares by Scriptures. Numb. 6. 23. Deut. 26. 13. & 15. Psalme 78. in the title. Ier. 10. 11. Matth. 6. 9. Luke 11. 1.

Iohn 7. 37. and 18. 12.

N. These

N. Theſe teſtimonies ſhall be examined, when we intreat of *the Lords Prayer*. Now further, I thus reaſon. *True Prayer hath the ſpirit of Prayer.* But *Set Prayer hath it not.* Ergo.

I. The Spirit of Prayer is double. Firſt, by infuſion, which giueth abilitie to inuent extemporall Prayer. Secondly, by Aſſiſtance. Thus a man may reade a Prayer, with the ſpirit of him that deuiſed it. with this ſpirit of ſerching diligence being aſſiſtant, Saint Luke wrote his Goſpell, and Saint Iude his Epiſtle. *Luke* 1.3. *Iude* 3.

N. Set Prayer to *priuate men* may be granted. But that it ſhould be impoſed vpon *Miniſters*, who ſhould not be deſtitute of *the ſpirit* of *conceiuing prayer*; cannot be affirmed without bluſhing. And that it may not bee impoſed I thus proue. *No part of Gods worſhip may bee impoſed by mens authoritie: But ſuch is ſet Prayer.* Ergo.

I. Prayers in Hebrew may be commanded, and yet are parts of Gods worſhip, as being parcels of the Bible. *Ergo.*

N. They may bee commanded among *the Iewes*, not amongſt *vs.* For though *Prayer* bee *a ſubſtantiall part* of *Religion*; yet *the language* is only *a Circumſtance.*

I. No leſſe is the ſetting of prayer, but a circumſtance thereof.

N. Surely ſuch a one as deuoures the *ſubſtance*, for it quencheth *deuotion.*

I. Nay, it reuiueth deuotion, being moſt auailable to three things: Order, Decencie, Edifica-

dification. Order is helpt two wayes. For first, by reason of Vnitie comes Vniformitie, which is the pith of Order. Conſider I pray you if euery man might at his owne arbitrement deuiſe prayers, would there not be as many Liturgies as there were gods among the Ethiopians, where each man had a peculiar god? Secondly, order in Prayer, that is a methodicall diſpoſition of Petitions, gratulations, and the like, is moſt readily found in Set Prayer. Whereas your extemporall and vndigeſted prayers are ordinarily as vncertaine as the ſands of Hammonia. The decencie of Set Prayer is manifeſt by the vnſeemely Tautologies, which carry the mind of him that prayeth without præmeditation, like Pauls ſhip betweene two Seas. Edification is two wayes miniſtred by Set Prayer. First, the hearers minde is called to concurre with the Miniſter. Secondly, a full complement of Petitions is hereby purchaſed, which on the ſudaine could not be conceiued.

N. To grant you that *Prayer* may be impoſed by *authoritie*, yet *ſubcription* to the *Liturgie* is *an iron yoke.*

I. Before you attempt to proue this, obſerue theſe two things. First, that as the furies were the three daughters of the ſame night: So from the ſame night of errour doe iſſue the Separatiſts denying Set Prayer. The Anabaptiſt renouncing humane authoritie. The Noualiſt denouncing

cing warre to subscription. For when the Barrowist will admit no meditation in prayer, doth he not seeme to harken after the reuelations of the Enthusiast? And when the all purging reformer will not subscribe to authoritie. Doth he not sing the same catch with H.N.

N. I regard not *the Browniſt* nor *Familiſt*: but only *the truth* in sinceritie.

I. We ought to marke, not what you follow in words, but what followeth of your words.

N. To let goe your *carping consequences*: we detest the *Anabaptist*: and protest against the *Barrowist*.

I. I will demonstrate the former, vpon an other occasion to bee most vntrue, or vnprobable. Against the latter I thus reason. Of them that thinke the Church of England to bee no Church; they lesse transgresse against their conscience which doe forsake it. But the *Barrowist* and you, imagine so of our Church: The *Barrowist* therefore is more excusable then you.

N. Your *Minor* is vncharitable. For *we* hold it to be *a true*, though *a corrupt Church*.

I. You condemne her Liturgie, Ministerie, Gouernment. *Ergo.*

N. What wee condemne shall be tried in due place.

I. Meane while take this second obseruation. Doe you impugne Subscription in Word, or Deed? for many Conforme which will not Subscribe.

N. We approue not them: For a *daily publique Conformitie*, is more then a *single*, and almost *solitary Subscription*. Now generally against *Subscription* I thus dispute. *To subscribe to a thing that shall be altred is vnlawfull: But a new Translation is expected: and new Homilies promised to bee set forth by common authoritie.* Ergo.

Ceremonia dicta est, à χαιρὸς & μένω, to remaine for a time.

I. If your Maior were firme. How might the Iewes in ancient time haue subscribed to the Ceremonies in Moses Law, which were to bee altred by Christ. Or how may subiects sweare to the obseruation of a Law, which is repealable at the next Session of a Parliament? Againe your Minor doth rely vpon two dreames. For first you suppose that in the new Translation all things shall bee innouated according to your doubts, as Polycletus made an Image according to the minde of the multitude. Secondly, whereas one and twentie Homilies before promised are now extant, you still suspect that some errours shall bee obtruded vpon you by authoritie.

N. We haue as little cause to hope the first, as iust to feare the latter. My next reason then is this. *To subscribe to knowne errours, is little better then heresie. But in your Seruice-booke is a masse of Errours.* Ergo.

I. The Maior of this reason is refelled by the Minor of the former argument. For if the Translation shalbe corrected by reason of some

errours

errours supposed therein. It is cleere that the intent of Subscription is only to oblige vs, to thinke that no fundamentall errour is lurking in it: seeing no Booke (saue the authentique Canon of the text) can claime to it selfe simple immunitie from errour. The masse of errours mentioned in your Minor, will bee to massie a worke for you to proue.

Errorum massa Missa.

N. My last argument doth thus proceed: *It is a crying sinne to subscribe to antichristianisme. But such is your Liturgie according to your owne former definition, as being imposed vpon the Conscience with pretended necessitie.* Ergo.

I. Your Minor is a misprision: For I said that Antichrist imposeth things indifferent as necessary to saluation. But you, altering the state of the question, intreat about necessitie of Conformitie, vnder the penalty of Depriuation, not of eternall life, but of a momentanie liuing: And yet all both Nations and Religions haue vrged this vniforme order.

Ignorantia Elenchi.

N. Doth not then *Subscription* binde the *Conscience?*

I. It bindes, as it is an oath tendered to God directly: and yet indirectly also, as it is an humane constitution. So ill Positiue Lawes tie the Conscience by vertue of the fift precept of the Decalogue.

N. Things *indifferent* cannot binde *Conscience*: *But Ecclesiasticall Lawes are about things indifferent.* Ergo.

Figura dictionis & quatuor termini.

N. We approue not them: For a *daily publique Conformitie*, is more then a *single*, and almost *solitary Subscription*. Now generally against *Subscription* I thus dispute. *To subscribe to a thing that shall be altred is vnlawfull: But a new Translation is expected: and new Homilies promised to bee set forth by common authoritie.* Ergo.

Ceremonia dicta est, à χαιρὸς & μένω, to remaine for a time.

I. If your Maior were firme. How might the Iewes in ancient time haue subscribed to the Ceremonies in Moses Law, which were to bee altred by Christ. Or how may subiects sweare to the obseruation of a Law, which is repealable at the next Session of a Parliament? Againe your Minor doth rely vpon two dreames. For first you suppose that in the new Translation all things shall bee innouated according to your doubts, as Polycletus made an Image according to the minde of the multitude. Secondly, whereas one and twentie Homilies before promised are now extant, you still suspect that some errours shall bee obtruded vpon you by authoritie.

N. We haue as little cause to hope the first, as iust to feare the latter. My next reason then is this. *To subscribe to knowne errours, is little better then heresie. But in your Seruice-booke is a masse of Errours.* Ergo.

I. The Maior of this reason is refelled by the Minor of the former argument. For if the Translation shalbe corrected by reason of some

errours

errours supposed therein. It is cleere that the intent of Subscription is only to oblige vs, to thinke that no fundamentall errour is lurking in it: seeing no Booke (saue the authentique Canon of the text) can claime to it selfe simple immunitie from errour. The masse of errours mentioned in your Minor, will bee to massie a worke for you to proue.

Errorum massa Missa.

N. My last argument doth thus proceed: *It is a crying sinne to subscribe to antichristianisme. But such is your Liturgie according to your owne former definition, as being imposed vpon the Conscience with pretended necessitie.* Ergo.

I. Your Minor is a mispision: For I said that Antichrist imposeth things indifferent as necessary to saluation. But you, altering the state of the question, intreat about necessitie of Conformitie, vnder the penalty of Depriuation, not of eternall life, but of a momentanie liuing: And yet all both Nations and Religions haue urged this vniforme order.

Ignorantia Elenchi.

N. Doth not then *Subscription* binde the *Conscience?*

I. It bindes, as it is an oath tendered to God directly: and yet indirectly also, as it is an humane constitution. So ill Positiue Lawes tie the Conscience by vertue of the fift precept of the Decalogue.

N. Things *indifferent* cannot binde *Conscience*: *But Ecclesiasticall Lawes are about things indifferent.* Ergo.

Figura dictionis & quatuor termini.

I.

N. We approue not them: For a *daily publique Conformitie*, is more then a *single*, and almost *solitary Subscription*. Now generally against *Subscription* I thus dispute. *To subscribe to a thing that shall be altred is vnlawfull: But a new Translation is expected: and new Homilies promised to bee set forth by common authoritie.* Ergo.

Ceremonia dicta est, à χαιρὸς & μένω, to remaine for a time.

I. If your Maior were firme. How might the Iewes in ancient time haue subscribed to the Ceremonies in Moses Law, which were to bee altred by Christ. Or how may subiects sweare to the obseruation of a Law, which is repealable at the next Session of a Parliament? Against your Minor doth rely vpon two dreames. For first you suppose that in the new Translation all things shall bee innouated according to your doubts, as Polycletus made an Image according to the minde of the multitude. Secondly, whereas one and twentie Homilies before promised are now extant, you still suspect that some errours shall bee obtruded vpon you by authoritie.

N. We haue as little cause to hope the first, as iust to feare the latter. My next reason then is this. *To subscribe to knowne errours, is little better then heresie. But in your Seruice-booke is a masse of Errours.* Ergo.

I. The Maior of this reason is refelled by the Minor of the former argument. For if the Translation shalbe corrected by reason of some

errours

errours supposed therein. It is cleere that the intent of Subscription is only to oblige vs, to thinke that no fundamentall errour is lurking in it: seeing no Booke (saue the authentique Canon of the text) can claime to it selfe simple immunitie from errour. The masse of errours mentioned in your Minor, will bee to massie a worke for you to proue.

Errorum massa Missa.

N. My last argument doth thus proceed: *It is a crying sinne to subscribe to antichristianisme. But such is your Liturgie according to your owne former definition, as being imposed vpon the Conscience with pretended necessitie.* Ergo.

I. Your Minor is a misprision: For I said that Antichrist imposeth things indifferent as necessary to saluation. But you, altering the state of the question, intreat about necessitie of Conformitie, vnder the penalty of Depriuation, not of eternall life, but of a momentanie liuing: And yet all both Nations and Religions haue vrged this vniforme order.

Ignorantia Elenchi.

N. Doth not then *Subscription* binde the *Conscience?*

I. It bindes, as it is an oath tendered to God directly: and yet indirectly also, as it is an humane constitution. So ill Positiue Lawes tie the Conscience by vertue of the fift precept of the Decalogue.

N. Things *indifferent* cannot binde *Conscience: But Ecclesiasticall Lawes are about things indifferent.* Ergo.

Figura dictionis & quatuor termini.

I.

I. Your double medium causeth your argument to play fast and loose. For Obedience in things indifferent is necessary, not indifferent.

N. What, then are wee bound to obey our lawfull Superiour in all things?

I. In things necessarily good, wee doe immediatly obey God: men only by consequence. If men command things euill, we obey by tollerating what they inflict, not by performing what they inioyne. In the first they declare what God commands to be done: in the latter, what to be indured. Wherefore it remaineth that things indifferent alone, are the proper object of humane Commandements.

N. No action is indifferent, but each thing commanded is an action. *Ergo.*

I. Your medium hath two faces like Ianus. For an action is to be considered, either simply and alone: and so it is good; as being a motion depending on the first mouer. Or ioyntly, with Circumstances, and that in a double manner. First, in regard of the abilitie or possibilitie whilst it may be done. Secondly, in the act, when it is performed. Before it bee done, it is indifferent; but once breaking out into act, it becommeth distinctly good or euill, according to the Circumstances which determine the same. Now an action commanded, is supposed as not yet done (whereupon the Hebrewes call the Imperatiue Moode, the

first

first future) and so remaineth many times indifferent.

CHAP. III.

Of Feasts, and Fasts.

N. TO omit your winding *Sophistry*, and sundry other arguments against *Subscription*, not as feeble, but expecting a fitter place: From the *person commanding*, I passe to the *things enioyned*: *Time*, *Place*, *Ornaments*. *Time* I diuide into *Feasts* and *Fasts*. Against your *Festiuals* I argue thus. *Dayes made holy by men, are lawlesse; But such are your holidayes.* Ergo..

I. Your Maior is refuted by [k] the Text.

N. These *Feasts* were appointed by *Prophetical inspiration*; therefore not meerely by *men*.

I. This answer is like that of Sympathie, and antipathie, or influence of Starres, and the like refuges of ignorance. How know you that Queene Hester was a Prophetesse? or Mordecai a Prophet? Would you trust the Story of the Maccabees, if there you should finde it written that Iudas was a Prophet? Is not this one of the Bookes that you would hisse out of the Church? Nay, may wee suppose that Iudas

k *Ester* 9.21. 1 *Mac.*4.59. *Iohn* 10.22.

(had he beene a Prophet) would haue translated to Leui, that dignitie which appertained to the Tribe of Iuda.

N. Dayes wherein God hath permitted man to labour; may not by men be sanctified: But such be your Church Holidayes. Ergo.

I. Your Maior is doubtfull, and dangerous. For if you meane, that daies which are not consecrated by God, may not by men to him be dedicated, you will soone deface all the outward face of Religion: whereof the most noble act hath, and doth consist in dedicating Goods and Lands to the Church. But if you intend that dayes because they are indifferent, may not by authoritie bee restrained and determined; then doe you bring into the Church an anarchie. In the one you follow Swingfeldius, in the other the Anabaptist; against which rocke, I perceiue you often rush.

N. I let slip your captious *inferences*, and hasten to the third proofe. *Your holidayes are dedicated to creatures; therefore vnlawfull.* My *Antecedent* thus appeares: The *Sabbath* or *Lords Day*, you call *Sunday*, giuing it to the *Sunne*: which as it is reproued by *Papists*: So some haue ignorantly turned it to the *Sonne of God*. With the like vanitie you giue *Munday* to the *Moone*. *Tuesday* to *Twisco*, or *Mars*. *Wednesday* to *Woden*, or *Mercurie*. *Thursday*, to thundring *Iupiter*. *Friday* to *Frico* or *Venus*. *Saturday* to *Saturne*: which *Deuils* were adored by *Pagans*.

Rhemists vpon Apoc. 1. 10.

I. We

I. Wee doe no more dedicate our dayes to creatures by whose names wee tearme them, then the Hebrewes did the moneth Abib to an eare of Corne: for so doth the word import. Further I maruell that you call the Lords Day the Sabbath: for the men of your ranke were wont to stile this a Iewish name. But there bee some opinions that bee as short liued as certaine creatures by the riuer Hyppanis, which liue but a day. Yea but the Rhemists do mislike the name Sunday. By this you may coniecture that our Liturgie was not borrowed from the Missall. Besides what needed Alesius to turne it into Latine, if it had bin before extant in the Portuise? Whereas you pretend, some haue deriued Sunday from the Sonne of God: true it is, they deduced it from the Sonne of righteousnesse, who is indeed the Sonne of the liuing God. Lastly, those Deuils which you pretend were, and are Planets, of whom euery day is named, according as the Planet ruleth at midnight before: As vpon Saturday night from twelue to one the Sunne raigneth, so the day ensuing is called Sunday. Besides that; a Musicall reason is rendred: Namely, that the fourth Planet is inclusiuely to be reckoned from the former. For example, Saturne hath his dominion vpon Saturday, then omitting Iupiter and Mars, you shall come to Sol, whose most effectuall working is vpon Sunday.

Dion in Augusto.

N. What speake you of the Superstitious

ruling of *Planets*: or ridiculous Musicke of *Starres*?

I. As it is idolatrous to worship Starres, or prophesie by them; so to denie all their naturall operations and dominions in things inferiour, is wilfully to repeale the Statutes enacted in the Parliament of experience. No lesse friuolous is it, to deride the long obserued harmonious consent of Planets.

N. With the same boldnesse, haue you consecrated the moneths to *Ianus. Februus*, *Mars*, *Iulius* and *Augustus Cæsar*: which names you haue borrowed from the *Heathens*: whereas the *numerall names of moneths* were thought in *Scripture* most conuenient.

I. Why may not moneths be stiled according to Planets, as well as Saint Luke named a place Mars his Street or Hill? Or why not as well as men haue retained the names of Planets after their Baptisme; For example, Denis was surnamed of Bacchus, Apollos of the Sun. Epaphras and Epaphroditus of Venus, Hermes, and Mercurius of Mercury. So Phebæ of the Moone: Was not the badge of the ship wherein Paul sailed, called Castor and Pollux? Is not the like to bee seene in the Old Testament; both in the names of Places: as Beth-shemesh, the house of the Sunne: and Beth Dagon, the house of Dagon? As also of Persons? I will not insist, as some might doe vpon this: That Ianuary is not named of Ianus, but of

Acts 17.19. πάγος is a hill of πάγη a Doricke word, for a Spring: because Springs issue out of hils.

Acts 17.34. & 18.24. *Rom.* 16. 1. & 14. *Phil.* 2.25. *Col.* 1.7. *Acts* 28.11. *Iosua* 15.10. & 41. *Dan.* 1.7.

Ia

Ianua, a Gate, as being the entrance of the yeare. Not February of Februus, but a febribus of Agues, being a moneth obnoxious to that disease. No, nor March of Mars; but because things bred therein are martiall and valiant, agreeable to the Planet, not to the Idoll Mars. Now whereas you are displeased that moneths haue their appellations from Iulius and Augustus Cæsar: Why might not this be indured, as well as the Citie of Dauid; or Gibea of Saul? 2.*Sam.*6.10. *Esay* 10.29. If Places, why may not Times be tearmed after men? But these names are borrowed from Heathens. Did not the Hebrewes borrow the names of their moneths from the Chaldeans? (Except wee thinke the fourth moneth Tammuz was taken from the Egyptians) Was not *Ezek.*8.14. Abib the first moneth, surnamed Nisan? Tisri, the seuenth, Ethanim? Chisleu, the ninth, Bull? Of these some are apparẽtly, Chaldean words. Lastly, whereas you pretend, that the numerall names of moneths (as the first, second, &c.) were thought most conuenient. This to bee vntrue, you partly now perceiue, by the other names attributed to them in Scriptures. Also you know that September, & the three moneths following, haue names from number: and that in old time July, and August were called Quintilis and Sextilis.

N. To let passe your *Heathen names* of *Dayes* and *Moneths*: I proceed to your *Popish* names, by which you honour *Creatures*: and especially *Saints*.

I. Religious worship of Saints, is against the streame of our Church Doctrine. If we praise them, and God, in and for them; If we propound them as triumphant lights and markes of imitation: with what viperous teeth can enuy carpe at vs, vnlesse the same also doe gnaw out the bowels of the Primitiue Church?

N. Obseruation of dayes is forbidden by *Paul.*

Gal 4.10.

I. Namely, as parts of Gods worship, or as such necessary workes, as without which saluation cannot be obtained.

N. Two dayes you obserue in honour of the *Virgin*, which you hold as meerely necessarie: the *Purification*, and the *Annunciation.*

I. Wee ascribe to them no necessitie but of order. Now whereas foure dayes were kept in Popery, for the Virgin Mary, wee haue abolished two. First, the day of her Conception. Secondly, of her Assumption; the one being blasphemous, the other fabulous. Concerning the other two, we consecrate them not to the Virgin, but to Christ: whose Conception is remembred vpon the day of the Annunciation: and Presentation in the Temple, in the day of the Purification: as may bee collected both by the Collect; as also because wee reckon the yeare of our Lord from the Annunciation Day.

N. Besides this; you celebrate a day for *Michael*

chael the Archangell; whom you make a *Creature*.

I. If some of your owne spirit were present they would reproue your method, for placing the Virgin Mary before the Angels.

N. I did it, because I suppose you preferre her before them: her that sinned before them that were euer sinlesse.

I. Some doubt not, but that all men elect are in Christ his humanitie exalted aboue Angels. How much more doth this agree to her from whom did immediately proceed that which was assumed by the Godhead through the personall Vnion? Againe Christ tooke not Angels but the seed of Abraham.

N. The *Elect* indeed are said to bee equall to *Angels*: wherefore it seemeth they are not *superiours* to them. *Luke* 20.36.

I. They shall be equall to them in immortalitie, as also in that they shall not need procreation. Neuertheless in some other respect, they may exceed them. But now, that Michael is a creature, appeares first by Daniel: where Michael is called one of the chiefe Princes: and therfore may not be Christ. *Dan.* 10.13. & 22.

N. The *Hebrew* word which you translate *Chiefe*, may be turned *former*.

I. First, this cannot agree to Christ, who is not one of the former, but the first Prince: vnlesse you make three Princes of the three Persons in the Trinitie; which speech will not in-

dure

dure the Hammer of a good construction. Secondly, neither will it accord with Gabriels relation, who had not made mention of any former Princes.

N. If this your interpretation should be granted, yet *Michael* is but one of the *Chiefe*, not absolutely the chiefe *Angell*, or the *Archangell*, as you seeme to insinuate: which as it contradicteth your Communion Booke, mentioning *Archangels*: So can it not bee ballanced with reason.

I. Observe: First, that by this place in Daniel, we proue Archangels to bee; which some haue disliked. For Chiefe Princes and Archangels seeme to vs equipollent. Secondly, though we stile Michael an Archangell: yet by this we doe not simply pronounce him to be Chiefe of all Angels. For though many Chiefe Priests doe seeme to bee reckoned: yet each of these was not High Priest, but some one, or at the most two, in the corruptedst times. The like may be said of the word arch-heretique, or Patriarke. Thirdly, nenertheless, we doe probably thinke, both that there is one Chiefe created Angell: seeing Beelzebub is the Prince of Deuils: as also that this Archangell is Michael: not only because no other name of any Archangell is extant in Scripture, but principally because the last and greatest worke of Angels (namely, the raising of the dead) is said to bee committed to his Ministerie.

Mat. 26. 3.

Diabolus found only in the singular number. *Dæmon* and *Dæmonium* plurally.

1. *Thess* 4. 16.

N. But

N. But *Michael* is called the *Prince*. Now the *Prince* and *Captaine* of the *Church* is *Christ*.

I. Though we should yeeld that story in Ioshua to be meant of Christ, (which yet hardly will be euinced) notwithstanding wee deny it here to be so taken: First, because a Prince may either be absolutely so named (so is Christ alone) or by power delegate (and this may aswell agree to an heauenly Angell, as to an earthly King.) Secondly, because hee is called here Prince, with a tearme diminishing (at least in your construction, as you shall hereafter vnderstand) for the Angell saith, There is none that holdeth with me in these things, but *Michael* your Prince. Againe wee proue Michael to be a creature out of the Thessalonians before cited. For first, the word Archangell seemeth to signifie rather a principall Angell, then the Prince of Angels. Secondly, it is there said, The Lord shall descend with the voice of an Archangell: by the Lord, wee vnderstand Christ, as being opposed in relation to God. This speech then will haue no Coherence, Christ shall descend with the voice of the Archangell, that is of Christ.

Ioshua 5.14.

Compare *Iohn* 17.3. with 1. *Cor.* 8.6.

N. It seemeth the latter words; (*the trumpet of God*) doe interprete these that come before (*the voyce of the Archangell.*) Besides it is certaine that *Christ's voice* shall raise the *Dead*.

Iob. 5, 26. & 28.

I. It is the voice and trumpet of God the Father, and the Sonne, in regard of the authoritie

ritie and power thereof: and yet of Michael in respect of his Ministerie. As the same is te armed the Sword of the Lord and of Gideon.

Iudges 7.20.

Again we proue the same by Saint Iude, where it is said Michael durst not: which word little beseemeth the maiestie of Christ.

Iude 9.

N. The *Greeke* word may bee translated *hee could not indure*, that is, *hee could not abide to reuile* because it was a *sinne*. And it may seeme *the Story* is taken out of *Zachary*: So that by *the bodie of Moses*, it may seeme we are to vnderstand *the Religion of the Iewes*.

Zach. 3.1.

1. That signification is new to Interpreters: As for your exposition it is so violent, as if it were altered to the Inquisition. The Literall sence may not bee relinquished, till necessitie doe inforce. Lastly, we confirme the same by the Prophesie of Michael, where it is said that hee and his Angels ouercame the Dragon, by the bloud of the Lambe.

Apoc. 12.7.11.

N. But the name *Michael* signifieth *who is like God*: which appellation can agree to none but *Christ*.

1. This reason is weake, being built vpon the sand of Etymologie. Againe, why may not this word signifie who is like to the strong one: and so fully bee applied to a created Angell.

N. From *Angels* I come to *Apostles*: Where I obserue first, That you haue disanulled the *holiday of Pauls Conuersion*; as also of *Barnabas*:

and

and yet to them haue yee assigned *Epistles* and *Gospels*.

I. It was thought conuenient, that the Church should not be oppressed with multitude of holidayes: wherefore only the twelue Apostles were remembred, of which number Paul and Barnabas were not.

N. You seeme to intimate that *Barnabas* was an *Apostle*: and so indeed you stile him in his *Collect*.

I. The reason thereof is: First, because hee was chosen with Saint Paul: yea and seemed at that time to be preferred before him. Secondly, because hee chose Marke the Euangelist for his attendant; aswell as Saint Paul did Silas. Thirdly, because he seemeth to be reckoned amongst the Apostles.

Acts 13.2. *Acts* 15.39,40. 1. *Cor.* 9.5.6.

N. Next after the *Apostles*, I descend to the *Martyrs*: amongst whom you haue placed the *Children of Bethlehem*, whom I wonder you terme *Innocents*.

I. Were they not innocent, whose Parents were Iewes, who were in the Couenant of Circumcision.

N. But it may seeme: That this *Diuine iudgement* ouertooke them because their *Parents* inhumanely refused to lodge *Ioseph* and *Marie*.

I. Saint Luke yeeldeth a milder censure: namely, because there was no roome in the Inne: as it might bee by reason of the multitude of them, which hastning to bee taxed, preuented their comming.

Luke 2.7.

N. Could they bee *Martyrs* who could not vnderstand, much lesse acknowledge *Christ*?

I. Martyrs **they were not, either as** Saint Stephen **in** will **and** suffering: **or as** Saint Iohn, **in** will **but not in** suffering: **yet they were** Martyrs **in suffring for** Christ: **as** the Children of the Israelites **drowned by** Pharao **were in like manner** Martyrs **vnder the Law.**

N. Not the *punishment* but the *cause* makes a *Martyr*, which they could not vnderstand.

I. **The cause was** Christ, **a most fit cause of** martyrdome; **which though they vnderstand not, yet because** Gods Angels **defend** infants, **as well as** the rest of the Elect, God **vpon** his diuine **knowledge might auenge vpon** Herod **their bloud, as well as of other** Martyrs.

Math. 18.10. *Heb.* 1.14.

N. Your diuision of *Martyrs* is vntrue: For *Iohn* died a *violent death* as appeares by the prophesie of *Christ* concerning him.

Math. 20.23. compared with *Ioh.* 18.11

I. **First, it may be, the Cup may signifie as well affliction as death. Now that** Saint Iohn **was afflicted, it appeares by his confining** in Pathmos; **which is said to be vnder** Domitian. **Secondly, the speech of** Christ **may bee conditionall, not positiue; as if he had said,** though you should drinke of the cup of my death, yet might you not sit at my right hand, &c. **Now an** hypothetical **speech doth not inferre a positiue assertion. Thirdly, though** Saint Iohn **were a** Martyr **like** Stephen: **yet because** Steuen **was the first** voluntary Martyr; Saint Iohn (**though**

best

best beloued) must be placed after him: yea and after them both, the Innocent Children; as being Martyrs in another kind, dying for Christ besides, or before knowledge.

N. But *Herods* daughters childe (who then was at nurse in *Bethelem*) is said to be slaine with them: Could hee also being the vncircumcised Nephew of a vsurping Tyrant, an be tearmed an innocent Martyr.

I. First, if the most part were innocent; we draw the denomination from them: euen as we name them the Psalmes of Dauid, howsoeuer Psal 90. was made by Moses, and Psal. 137. was framed in the captiuitie of Babylon long after Dauid. So wee say the Acts of the Apostles: and yet in that booke are described actions of Stephen, Silas, Apollos, and others which were not Apostles. Secondly, what if God would hereby shew, that hee intended to haue Martyrs as well of the Gentiles, as of the Iewes: yea, and of infants as of men in yeares; seeing Christ is the Sauiour of them both. Thirdly, may we not say, that he which descended from Herod, was in a sort a Martyr that is, a witnesse of Gods power, who made Herod to kill his owne Sonne for rage, and yet deliuered Christ? Is not the like said of infants vpon a farre lesse respect by Dauid? *Psalme 8.2.*

N. From your *Feasts* I proceed to your *Fasts:* and first I wonder at your *Set Fasts?*

I. Meane you by Set Fasts, as you did by

Set Prayers? Haue not many Ministers of your opinion proclaimed and set sundry Solemne Fasts?

N. I meane your set yearely, and weekly *Fasts*: which should not be celebrated but when occasion of sorrow is presented. Now it may bee that some occasion of publique ioy may bee offered at the time of your *Anniuersary Fast*.

Math.9.15.

Leuit.16.29.& 23.29.

I. God appointed a yearely Fast in the tenth day of the seuenth moneth: and it might bee that some occasion of common ioy might then haue fallen out: So that you must either acknowledge a dispensation of Gods precept for a time: or that a particular and accidentary ioy could not preiudice a statarie and generall sorrow for sinne. Whereas you pretend that Christ said, his Disciples should not fast till after his departure, only because they should not till then haue iust cause of mourning and Fasting, it is vnsound: Seeing that in the verse following, he rendreth another reason; namely, for that they were weake like old garments and bottles: and therefore vncapable of this new discipline of Fasting.

N. I might returne you this answer: That the *Fast* mentioned in the *Law* was Ceremoniall: But, to grant that God might ordaine a yearely *Fast*; How appeareth it that the same libertie is permitted to men?

I. Indeed to fast vpon the tenth day of the seuenth moneth was a ceremony: Neuertheless

a yearely set Fast, could be no more Ceremoni: all then to rest once in seuen dayes: the tearmes are altered, the quantitie remaineth. Further that men may decree Set Fasts, it appeares by the Iewes, who fasted euery Yeare in remembrance of the siege of Ieruſalem, the winning thereof, and burning of the Temple, as also the death of Gedalia. The like is to be seene in the custome of the Phariſies, and Iohn the Baptiſt. Lastly, some gather the same out of the story of Hester.

See *Iunius* vpon *Zach.*8.9. *Math.*19.14.

*Heſt.*9.31.

N. Though *Set Fasts* might bee allowed: yet your *Lent* is but an apish imitation of *Christ* his *Fast.*

I. No more apish then the custome of the Israelites, which they tooke vp in remembrance of Iacobs wrestling with the Angell. Now the custome of Lent, is not only ciuill, for the preseruation of Cattle, and employment of the Sea, and Riuers: not merely morall to temper lust, which riseth with the bloud in the Spring: to inable men for deeds of Liberalitie: but euen in a sort Religious (not as a part, but as a helpe of Religion) first to kindle Prayer, much dulled with plethorie of the bodie, and multitude of businesse. Secondly, to helpe vs in the acknowledgement of our vnworthinesse of Gods creatures. Thirdly, to prepare vs for the solemne Communion at Easter: Besides, that we may fast and pray for the increase of grace, is cleere by the example of Cornelius.

*Geneſ.*32.32.

*Act.*10.30,31.

N. But

N. But what shall wee thinke of your *Ember weekes?*

Acts 13 2. I. They are preparatiues to the Ordination of Ministers: Before which how laudable it is to fast is manifest by the separation of Barnabas and Paul.

N. What grounds haue your *Fasts* vpon *Wednesdayes*, *Fridayes*, and *Saturdayes*.

I. Friday was by all obserued because Christ died on that day. Some kept Saturday, for that Christ on that day lay in the graue; which was to all Beleeuers a season of great heauinesse. Others chose rather Wednesday, for that, vpon that day Iudas sold our Sauiour for money. Besides these causes a conuenient vicissitude or exchange of Fasting with eating was iudged most requisite. Which also was the cause of our Holiday Eues.

Chap. IV.

Of Place; and Ornaments.

N. IT is now time; that from *Time* we should remoue our *Speech* to *Place*, and *Ornaments*, inioyned in the *act of Vniformitie*. Wherin although *Chancels* only bee

men-

mentioned, yet *Churches* also seeme necessarily to be presupposed.

I. This is not vnlike Solon or Romulus, who made no Lawes for Paricides, because they hoped such villany would not be committed. So it may bee our Law-giuers, did not there mention Churches, supposing no Christian would be of so leaden a heart, and brasen a forehead, as directly to wish the abolishment of Churches. For what I pray you? Are you one of them that would haue Churches turned into Doue-coates and Alehouses?

N. Though that were iustifiable by the example of *Iehu*: yet it is sufficient for vs, if they were demolished. Neuertheless I speake not this of mine owne opinion, but according to the intent of some of the Brethren. The first reason is this. *Churches are abused to Idolatry, therefore to bee destroyed.* 2. *Kings* 10. 27.

I. By this argument, Salomons Temple being abused by King Ahaz to manifest Idolatry, should haue beene razed by King Ezekias? Besides, what need you accuse the Barrowists? it is your owne argument: Will you leaue the nest like the Rauen, because the yong ones colour doth not in all points resemble you? Is not this your owne reason? The Crosse is abused to Idolatrie, therefore to be abrogated? As for the example of Iehu, it moues vs not. For neither was Iehu a good man: neither is euerie action of a good man, lawfull: though

lawfull, yet not necessarie in regard of imitation.

N. We insist not vpon *Iehu* his fact. Neither is our only, or principall reason against the Crosse, drawne from the abusing thereof to Idolatrie (as shall appeare in due place.) Neither would wee simply therfore haue *Churches* defaced, for that they are so abused: but vpon more important causes: Else should wee wish also the ruine of *Vniuersities*, which notwithstanding we are contented should remaine, if these things only were reformed. First, if humane Arts were lesse studied. Secondly, if Degrees in Schooles were interdicted. Thirdly, if Marriages in Colledges were permitted.

I. Arts may not properly be called humane, seeing they haue God for their Author, and are aides to expound diuine Scripture. First, for Grammar. Without the Hebrew and Chaldee, the Old Testament cannot bee vnderstood exactly, because not only some part of the text is written in the Chaldean tongue: but principally because the Chaldee Paraphrase is the most apt interpreter of the Bible. The Greeke tongue is also needfull in regard of the Septuagint, whom the Apostles more frequently cite then the Hebrew text. The Greeke to bee needfull in the New Testament, all acknowledge. The vse of the Syrian would appeare, if more diligence herein were vsed. As for the Latine, it is the tongue of the intercourse

of

of all the Learned in Christendome. Furthermore, hee that will conceiue Isaiah without Rhetorique; and Paul without Logique: the Psalmes without Musique and Poetrie: the Arke and Temple, without Geometrie: the perfect Chronologie of the Scriptures, without Arithmetique and Astronomie: Leviticus, Iob, and Canticles, without naturall Philosophy and Physicke: the Law of Moses without Ethiques, and Ciuill Law: the Stories of the Kings without Policie: Daniel, and the Apocalips without Historie; the same must assay with Xerxes to saile through the mount Athos; and walke dry-shod ouer Hellespont. This age is too superficiall in knowledge: Cast it not into a more lazie Lethargie, with this your vnseasoned zeale. Touching Degrees I say. Shall the meanest Mechanick Trade distinguish the Apprentice from the Journeyman: him from the occupier: and all from the Master or Warden of the Company: And shall there be no difference betweene Leuit & Priest? Priest, and High Priest? Lastly, what you say of Marriage, bewrayeth that you neuer slept in Parnassus: so great is the penurie of those places: and so dangerous the Marriage of persons Collegiate, vnlesse they bee Masters, Prouosts, or in the like Supreame place. But now returne from our Mother the Vniuersitie, to her Daughters the Churches: and shew vs those important causes for which you would haue them violated.

N. Places built for Idolatry; should bee destroyed: But such are your Churches. *Ergo.*

I. The proofe of your Maior is mistaken. Groues, Altars, Images are by Gods appointment to bee destroyd, or burnt (namely, the Tabernacle, or Temple remaining.) But that euery house or Church built to an Idoll should be pulled downe, and by no meanes conuerted to a Synagogue, cannot be inforced out of this place. Againe your Minor wants waight: For some of our Churches were built before, some since the daies of Poperie. Besides those which Papists did erect, were built for true prayer to God in Christ: what if much Idolatrie were mingled? Shall the siluer be reprobate because of the store of Tinne.

Apoc. 18. 2. *N.* Churches are those habitations of Antichrist, which are to be ruinated.

I. Some others would interprete them to be the Abbies, Nunneries, and such like cages of superstion. But it is not safe to build a doctrine vpon so misticall a prophesie.

Ezek. 8. 16. *N.* They are buist East and West, which the Prophet seemes to dislike.

I. No maruell: For they worshipped the Sunne rising. As for vs, we thinke that God is the God of the East, as well as of the North: and of the West, as well as of the South. Neither haue wee any such custome as to bee contentious for singularitie.

N. Their Dedication sauours of Superstiton.

I. If

1. If in ancient time any vnmeete prayers were vsed, wee abandon them in our Dedications. Notwithstanding, that Churches may bee dedicated, both that they may bee appropriated to God, and alienated from all Secular vse, so that occasion of alteration be cut off: As also that more reuerence may bee added to Gods publique seruice, appeares; First, by the examples of Salomon, Zerubbabel, and Iudas Maccabeus, who consecrated that Temple: the last whereof did then dedicate it when it had beene three yeares and a halfe polluted by Antiochus Epiphanes: whereas by your doctrine hee should haue leuelled it with the ground. But our Sauiour was of an other iudgement, who many yeares after graced that Feast of Dedication with his own presence. Secondly, the same is cleare by the rule of the Apostle, auouching all things to bee sanctified by the Word and Prayer. The equitie of which Canon seemeth to relie vpon the Law of God, whereby the builder of an house is exempted from seruice in warre, till hee hath performed the Dedication of his priuate building. *1. Tim. 4. 5.* *Deut. 20. 5.*

N. Chancels seeme to be ordained partly out of Superstition, partly, out of Pride: aduancing the Minister aboue the people.

1. It was no Superstition among the Iewes to separate the wiues from their husbands, by certaine partitions in the Temple: as is probably collected out of the Prophet. The *Zach. 12. 12.*

like is to be said of parting Minister and People. Neither may we thinke this done in imitation of the Iewish Temple only, considering there is nothing like the Holy of Holies in our Churches: but only a distinction of places, that hearing, and receiuing the Communion, by this difference of place, might beget a certaine diuersitie of reuerence. As for the pride obiected; it sheweth your disordred minde, who by cutting off all differences of Degrees and Orders, would soone bring backe the people to the Chaos of irreuerence. Thinke you that Ezra when he made the Pulpit of wood, whereby hee was aduanced aboue the People, did it of pride, or only that his voice might bee the more audible? Might not this also be intended: That by the height of his place, he might strike a certaine awfull reguard into his hearers hearts: Did not God for this cause giue to Moses, a shining face? Did he not therefore allot him, and Aaron the Priest, a place in the Mountaine, distinct from that of the multitude; that there might be conceiued a kinde of preheminence and dignitie of the Pastour aboue the sheepe? Is any man ignorant that the vulgar sort is led by formes, and externall differences in all affaires? Lastly, the charge of the Chancell being imposed vpon the Minister, may seeme to challenge for him a peculiar allotment of place.

Nehem. 8. 4.

N. To ouerpasse the *place*: the next circum-

stance

ſtance is in *Ornaments:* whereof the moſt ſcandalous is the *Surplice.* Againſt the which I thus reaſon. *No humane Rite may bee ordained in Gods ſeruice: But ſuch is your Surplice.* Ergo.

I. The method by your ſelfe duly propounded, explaineth your Maior, but diſclaimeth your Minor. For whereas you placed the Surplice among Ornaments: and ranked them amid the circumſtances: Your Maior muſt thus be expounded: That humane rites, howſoeuer they may bee circumſtances of Gods worſhip: yet ought not to bee inforced as any ſubſtantiall part thereof: and ſo your Minor will not abide the Touchſtone; ſeeing this garment is not ordained in, but about Gods worſhip. In ſumme, wee place therein, not neceſſitie of holineſſe, but peaceable vniformitie of order.

N. You ſeeme to tie certaine holineſſe vnto it: and ſo to incorporate it into Gods ſeruice: both in that you repute ſundry Miniſteriall actions being done without it, as not at all performed. As alſo in that you put a barre of *Silence* before their mouthes that refuſe it.

I. Your firſt allegation is little leſſe then calumnious: For you know, there is a maine difference betweene a nullitie, and a true act vnlawfully executed. For example, if Baptiſme be adminiſtred without this attire, howſoeuer the action bee diſorderly, yet may not the Sacrament be iterated: and therefore this act cannot

like is to be said of parting Minister and People. Neither may we thinke this done in imitation of the Iewish Temple only, considering there is nothing like the Holy of Holies in our Churches: but only a distinction of places, that hearing, and receiuing the Communion, by this difference of place, might beget a certaine diuersitie of reuerence. As for the pride obiected; it sheweth your disordred minde, who by cutting off all differences of Degrees and Orders, would soone bring backe the people to the Chaos of irreuerence. Thinke you that Ezra when he made the Pulpit of wood, whereby hee was aduanced aboue the People, did it of pride, or only that his voice might bee the more audible? Might not this also be intended: That by the height of his place, he might strike a certaine awfull reguard into his hearers hearts? Did not God for this cause giue to Moses, a shining face? Did he not therefore allot him, and Aaron the Priest, a place in the Mountaine, distinct from that of the multitude; that there might be conceiued a kinde of preheminence and dignitie of the Pastour aboue the sheepe? Is any man ignorant that the vulgar sort is led by formes, and externall differences in all affaires? Lastly, the charge of the Chancell being imposed vpon the Minister, may seeme to challenge for him a peculiar allotment of place.

Nehem. 8. 4.

N. To ouerpasse the *place*: the next circum-

stance

ſtance is in *Ornaments:* whereof the moſt ſcandalous is the *Surplice.* Againſt the which I thus reaſon. *No humane Rite may bee ordained in Gods ſeruice: But ſuch is your Surplice.* Ergo.

I. The method by your ſelfe duly propounded, explaineth your Maior, but diſclaimeth your Minor. For whereas you placed the Surplice among Ornaments: and ranked them amid the circumſtances: Your Maior muſt thus be expounded: That humane rites, howſoeuer they may bee circumſtances of Gods worſhip: yet ought not to bee inforced as any ſubſtantiall part thereof: and ſo your Minor will not abide the Touchſtone; ſeeing this garment is not ordained in, but about Gods worſhip. In ſumme, wee place therein, not neceſſitie of holineſſe, but peaceable vniformitie of order.

N. You ſeeme to tie certaine holineſſe vnto it: and ſo to incorporate it into Gods ſeruice: both in that you repute ſundry Miniſteriall actions being done without it, as not at all performed. As alſo in that you put a barre of *Silence* before their mouthes that refuſe it.

I. Your firſt allegation is little leſſe then calumnious: For you know, there is a maine difference betweene a nullitie, and a true act vnlawfully executed. For example, if Baptiſme be adminiſtred without this attire, howſoeuer the action bee diſorderly, yet may not the Sacrament be iterated: and therefore this act cannot

not be adiudged for a meere nullitie. Your second assertion was refuted before when wee intreated of Subscription. To which notwithstanding this might be added. First, might Salomon put Shimei to death for violating his comandement concerning a thing in it owne nature indifferent: Namely, that he should not passe ouer the riuer Kidron? Nay, might hee tender an oath vnto him, to the intent that his obligation might be more firme? And may not we, both vrge you to Subscription to things indifferent? & inflict punishmēt vpon you, if either you refuse to Subscribe: or if subcribing you afterwards transgresse your promise? Might Shimei plead to the King, the thing you require me to sweare to, is in it owne nature simply indifferent: ergo: therefore this oath is but a burthen to my conscience? Could the King haue wished a more direct pretence of putting this malecontent to death, then such an vnreasonable allegation as this? Secondly, could Ionadab by his commandement for euer interdict the Rechabites, the Dwelling in houses, sowing of Corne, planting Vines, drinking wine; (which all were things indifferent) and cannot the like necessitie of obedience to our Lawes in things of equall indifferencie seeme reasonable? Thirdly, the rule of Saint Paul ought to be remembred; If any man consent not to the doctrine, according to godlinesse, he is puffed vp, &c. Is not consenting, a kinde of Subscription? Are

1. Kings 2.37.

Ier. 35.6,7.

1. Tim. 6.3.

not

not things indifferent and conuenient agreeable to the doctrine according to godlinesse. These people therefore that are vnorderly, and leaue their station: are to bee reduced to a sound minde, euen with some moderate correction. 2. *Thess.* 5. 14.

N. Though the *Surplice* were indifferent: yet is it not conuenient, as thus may bee demonstrated. *That garment which was worne by the Priests of* Isis, Iewes, *and* Papists, *is by vs to bee refused as inconuenient: But such is the Surplice*; Ergo. The *Minor* is plaine by Story: and concerning the Papists in part by Prophesie. *Apoc.* 18. 12.

I. Your new found storie of the women Priests of Isis refuseth your Maior. For I trust you cãnot proue that the Priests of Israel weare the linnen Ephod before the Priests of Isis. which if it bee so, then consider againe your Maior. The garment worne by the Priests of Isis, may not be worne by the Leuites. But this is manifestly vntrue. The first part of your Minor is vncertaine: namely, that the garment of the Egyptian and Hebrew Priests, was like our Dalmatique, or Surplice. The latter concerning Papists is weakly confirmed. For first that word which is translated Linnen, by learned men is auouched to be meant Silke. Now where will you finde a silken Surplice? Againe if all linnen vsed by the Whore of Babylon, should be abolished, what should become of the linnen at the Communion Table: nay, what should be done with the siluer Chalices? for they

also were abused by her: and are mentioned likewise in that verse. Lastly, it were easie to proue out of antiquitie (but that you reuerence not her hoarie head) that the Surplice was, before Poperie was hatcht.

N. Popery, being *Antichristianitie* did worke in the dayes of the Apostles, by sundry both errours and rites: Of which number the *Surplice* to be one, is proued by this Argument. *Euerie Rite, or Ceremonie should edifie* (so saith your owne *Liturgie.*) *But so doth not your Surplice.* Ergo.

I. It doth edifie, not by any proper action thereof: but by a profitable signification.

N. Humane significations cannot edifie: But such are those of the Surplice. *Ergo.*

I Kneeling in praier is but humane, though it signifie reuerence to God. The like may bee said of sitting at the Passeouer: And yet some of your owne combination haue said, that it signifies a spirituall familiaritie with God.

N. They haue said so of sitting at the Lords Supper, but not at the Passeouer, and yet indeed those two *Sacraments* are but one in substance. Besides though the things were humane; yet the significations were and are diuine: I meane in regard of the things themselues, not in respect of the appointment which was from men, led by the light of Nature.

I. In this sence, the signification of the Surplice is diuine: First in generall to testifie a re-

reuerent distinction betweene the Minister and People. Secondly, in more Specialty to bee a symbole of [a] alacritie, of [b] integritie, of our long expected [c] glorie in heauen.

a *Eccles.* 9.8.
b *Apoc.* 3.18.
c *Matth.* 17.2. *Acts* 10.20. *Apoc.* 3.4. & 6.11.

CHAP. V.

The Preface. Of the Common Prayers.

ARguments drawne from Scandal (though very forcible against the *Surplice*) yet shall be omitted till we come to the *Crosse*. Now from the Circumstances I proceed to the substance of the *Liturgie*. Whereof there be two parts. First, only *Speech*. Secondly *action*, ioyned with *Speech*, called a *Rite* or *Ceremonie*. Concerning the first, either the *people* speaketh, or *God*. The *people* speaketh to *God* by *Prayer*, or by *Confession*. *Prayers* be either ordinary and common (which are continually read) or peculiar to some times (tearmed *Collects*.) In the *Preface Inuitatorie* to *the Common Prayers* we dislike *two things*. First, the words: (*At what time soeuer, &c.*) seeme to be alledged out of *Ezekiell*: which neither be there to be found: and withall, seeme to promise *salvation* to *them*, which deferre *repentance* to *the very moment of*

death. For they insinuate, *that a man may repent, at what time soeuer he will.*

Ezek 18.21,22.

I. It is not a iust citation of the Prophets wordes: but an explanatiue allegation of the sence: For first, the word if, in the Prophet is equiualent with these words in the Liturgie (at what time soeuer.) For it is a Logique maxime, that a temporal proposition is equipollent to a conditionall. Secondly, these words, (from the bottome of his heart) in the Liturgie, are explained by those in the Prophet (will returne from all his sinnes that he hath committed: and keepe all my statutes, and doe that which is lawfull and right) for hee that performeth these things doth indeed repent from the bottome of his heart. Thirdly, these words in the Prayer Booke (I will put them out of my remembrance) are answerable to those in the Prophet (they shall not bee mentioned to him or remembred. The Hebrew word signifying both: By all which it is cleare, that late repentance is aswell fished out of the Prophet, as out of the Liturgie. The truth is, If a man repent at any time, he shall bee saued. It followeth not hereupon that a man may repent at what time hee will assigne, seeing repentance only comes from God.

The like citations are in *Rom.* 5.5 & 1. *Cor.* 2.9. out of *Esay* 28. 16. & 64.4.

N. You haue now contradicted a speech deliuered by your selfe: Namely, *that late repentance is not good.*

In a certaine Sermon.

I. To admit of your owne disioynted report. First, That is, late repentance, which is pre-

presumptuously procrastinated to the Catastrophe of life. This is ordinarily as weake and sicke as the bodie, and is intombed with it. Secondly, Though this repentance by some miracle might be true, yet is it not good, that is, dangerous, and [d] scandalous. For the repentance of Adam and Salomon, are therefore not mentioned directly, because their offence did more hurt, then their repentance did good.

[d] 1. Cor. 7. 1.

N. The second thing disallowed in the *Preface*, is in these words *(saying after me.)* By which *the people* are commanded to repeat *the Confession* after the *Minister*.

1. I neuer heard of any man punished for not repeating this in the Church.

N. If the thing were lawfull and conuenient, this Commandement might sufficiently binde. But the inconuenience thereof may thus appeare. *As it is before a Prince, so it is before God: But it is not seemely before a Prince, that a whole Incorporation should speake together.* For which cause a *Speaker* as a *common mouth*, is chosen to propound their *suite*. Wherefore it is vnfit that the *people* should recite the *Confession* with, or after the *Minister*.

Mal. 1. 8.

1. First, were your Maior true, then were it vnfit to sing Psalmes in Gods presence. For it will be hardly decent before a Prince to declare a suite singing:) which argument, some of your feather haue taken vp against Church Musique: not remembring that with the same

they impugne all Psalmodie: Secondly, this propsition would assist the Popish invocation of God by Saints. Seeing we hardly approch to Princes, but by manifold mediators. Thirdly, the reason of the dissimilitude is this. No mortall Monarch can at once vnderstand all suitors: which is to God most easie: being the eye that sees all: the eare that heares all; and the hand that writes all. As for the argument of the Prophet Malachy, it is of an other colour, and indeed drawne from an other place. Hee reasoneth from the greater to the lesse: For it is more likely, that a mortall Prince (whose breath is in his nosthrils) should accept of an imperfect present: then God who turneth the hearts of Kings, as riuers in the South. Your reason is drawne from the equall, which is a most vnequall comparison. Lastly, though the people rehearse the Confession after the Minister: yet is he their mouth, both in going before, and instructing them: and so the latter part of your Minor, is like a broken reed.

A magis probabili. For it is the meaning of the place, *à maiore ad minus.*

1. Cor. 14. 16. *N.* It seemeth *the vnlearned* should answer no more then *Amen.*

I. First, from a conceiued to a set Prayer, the argument is weake. Secondly, If this interpretation of the place were redred (how shall the vnlearned say Amen. that is, how shall he vnderstand, and consent vnto those prayers, which I vtter in a strange tongue) how impertinent will your reason be? Thirdly, though it might

might be proued elsewhere, that the people is bound to answere Amen; will you hereupon inferre, that they may vtter no more. But more of this, when you come to the Responsale.

Deut. 27. 15.

N. But by this practice *a woman is allowed to speake in the Church*, which *Paul* doth prohibit.

1. Cor. 14. 34.

I. He forbids women to teach, or propound questions in the Church: but not to answer Amen, or pray iointly with others.

N. This *Confession*, as it is repeated by the *people*; is neither *publique prayer* (as being rehearsed by priuate men) neither yet that kinde of Prayer which we tearme priuate or solitarie (being recited in a publique place) and therefore no true kinde of prayer.

I. This is like an ancient plea in Law. A priuate mans money was stolne out of a Temple. The question was: whether it were theft or sacriledge? But as I suppose, the latter opinion should there preuaile: So here I answer, That this is publique Prayer, as being dictated by a Minister, and repeated only by the whole Congregation in a place most publique.

N. It seemeth strange, That the people is enioyned to repeate after this manner only this *Prayer*: the *Confession*, in the *Communion*: and the *Creed* of the *Apostles*.

I. The reason is obuious: because in the Confession of our sinnes, and faith there is required a most personall application: wherby many

many ſerious motions are ſtirred vp in the heart, otherwiſe moſt adamantine.

Chap. VI.

Of the Lords Prayer.

N. AFter the *Preface* I come to *the ordinarie Prayers*: which either bee deliuered in *proſe*, and pronounced in plaine direct ſpeech: Or elſe are *hymnes*. Of the former kinde, The firſt wee diſlike is, *the abſolution*: which of late hath gotten a new name of *remiſſion*, at the inſtant requeſt of ſome of our men.

I. Not vnlike the commander of the Turks: who will not be ſtiled King or Emperour, but Turke, or Great Turke: a name ſurmounting all ambition.

N. What reaſon wee had for the change of that name, you ſhall heare when wee treate of the viſitation of the ſicke. Now we will proceede to *the Lords Prayer*: Wherein ſome brethren are diſpleaſed, becauſe it is vſed as a Prayer. But wee not allowing of their Zeale; doe notwithſtanding diſlike your *battalogie*: ſeeing you repeate it eight times at one meeting, vpon ſundrie occaſions. As alſo that you omit the *Doxologie*, or concluſion of the *Lords Prayer* (for thine

Matth. 6. 13.

is

is the kingdome, &c.) which is found in the Gospell: And this omission is so much the worse, because it fetcheth the pedegree from the *Masse-Booke.*

I. Although you relinquish the brethren of the Seperation (which is the English word for a Schisme) yet I pray of all courtesie, let me ouer intreate you to answere their arguments concerning this matter.

N. Although you seeme to turne the buckler into the sword: and to shoote at suspicious rouers: yet least you should imagine mee to bee smoak'd with Barrowisme: I will attempt to answere the reasons, if you propound them.

I. The first reason is this: It is said: pray thus (that is in this manner, to this effect or sense.) It is not written pray this prayer (that is conceiue or take together these verie syllables. This interpretation is confirmed; first by the like in Moses, where it is written, thus shall yee blesse (thus I say, and not this:) Secondly, because else we were obliged to vse no other forme then the Lords prayer.

Numb. 6. 23.

N. The reason faileth: First, because by this argument: when the Prophet saith, *thus* saith the *Lord*, and when God saith, *Thus shalt thou deale*: we should conceiue the rehearsall of the verie words: and the performance of the verie deede not to be inioyned. Notwithstanding we know that the Prophets had not only their matter and method, but euen their verie words from

Eight times in *Amos* 1. & 2. *Deut.* 7 5.

the neuer erring ſpirit; and that *Gods Law* may not bee illuded: Secondly, it is written in *Luke*, *Pray ſaying*: ſo that not onely the obſeruation of the matter, but euen the repetition of the words is commanded. The place in *Moſes* is not aptly paraleld. For in what language will theſe words receiue a good conſtruction. *Bleſſe, this* (that is, vſe this precife forme of bleſſing:) Laſtly, whereas they pretend, that we ſhould be bound to vſe no forme of Prayer, but the Lords: This onely indeede may bee inſteade thereof: Namely, that we ought to vſe this Prayer both as a mirrour, and exemplarie direction to all our ſuites: and as *an abſolute complement of our imperfect Prayers.*

Luke 11.2.

I: **The ſecond argument is this: Wee reade not that this prayer was euer vſed by the Apoſtles.**

Acts 4.24.

N. We neuer read that the Apoſtles prayed together in publique, but once: and vpon a particular occaſion (I meane where the words of their prayers are ſpecified.) Vpon this negatiue teſtimonie, wee may not conclude in a matter of fact. For I haue heard ſome report out of old Books, that S. *Peter* vſedit in *Baptiſme*. Howſoeuer this be, (for it is vncertaine) yet as God commanded a Feaſt, and *Elias* promiſed *a double portion of the ſpirit to Eliſha*, though the performance of theſe be not ſet downe, yet no ſcruple is to be made of them. So, foraſmuch as *Chriſt* commanded his Diſciples to vſe this prayer, we

Leuit. 16 29.
2. *Kings* 2.10.

may

may not doubt of their obedience herein, though it be not expreſt.

I. I render you due thankes for this digreſſion: Howbeit, you ſhall now perceiue that wee haue not digreſſed at all. To come then to your firſt exception of Bartologie. Wee anſwere, that vaine repetition is, when words are repeated, being directed neither with reaſon of art, neither with zeale of the heart, neither with a ſuppoſall of a iuſtly implied neceſſitie. The two firſt ſeeme to bee in that famous repetition (for his mercie endureth for euer:) the third in that rehearſall of Chriſt: All three appeare in our vſe of the Lords Praier. For ſeeing that we know not what to pray as we ought, wee make this prayer as a complement of all our imperfections, and that with arte and zeale (we hope) ſufficient.

26 times in the 136. *Pſalme Matth.* 26.44.

N. But why doe you iterate it eight times at one meeting?

I. It is as rare a thing to come to ſuch a meeting, as to behold a Tree bearing Nuts, Figs, Cheries, and Apples. But firſt we vſe it almoſt in the entrance of our prayer after the Abſolution: Secondly, after the Creed: whereof one reaſon may bee drawne out of the Queenes Iniunctions, wherein it was appointed, that after the ſecond Leſſon (if there were no Sermon) the Creed, the Lords Prayer, and ten Commandements, ſhould bee read for the inſtruction of the ignorant: Another reaſon

may bee this; many are not present at the rehearsall of the Lords Prayer: seeing the mulct of absence is not inflicted, if men come whilst the Psalmes are in reading. This prayer therefore, being so necessary, is conueniently then repeated, to aide either the negligence or necessities of many commers. Thirdly, we ioyne this Prayer to the Letanie, because it is oftentimes said alone (as vpon Wednesdayes and Fridayes.) Now this (as also all other Prayers) were imperfect without this supplement of the diuine Prayer: which if you denie, you fall into the quicke sand of Brownisme. The other fine times, namely, at the two Sacraments, Marriage, Churching, Buriall, because the actions are many times distinct and alone, yea and seldome, or neuer all concurre, may seuerally seeme to require the annexing of this heauenly Prayer.

N. You haue inuented shifts in appearance for your needlesse repetitions: But how can you cleake the omitting of the *Doxologie?*

I. First, you neuer heard of any man molested or rebuked for repeating the same: For indeed the rehearsall thereof is not prohibited: Secondly, it is omitted, not only in the vulgar translation, but euen in one ancient Greek Copie (as Beza witnesseth.) Thirdly, it is also left out in Luke, who would not haue neglected an essentiall necessarie part of so exact a Prayer.

Luke 11.5.

N. If this bee wanting, *Prayer* will bee defectiue: as contayning *Petitions*, but no *Thanksgiuing*.

1. First, some might say: That CHRIST taught vs to aske, but not to giue thankes: not because gratulation is lesse needfull, but more easie. For to a man that asketh according to knowledge, if his demands be granted, it will be no great difficultie to bring in the harueſt of thankes, according to his owne Seed-time of Petitions: Secondly, some doe auouch that in each petition all kindes of Prayer appointed by Saint Paul, are by consequence implied: Thirdly, these words hallowed bee thy name, if they bee interpreted as a Thankesgiuing, your argument were at an end: Fourthly, this conclusion of the Lords Prayer will hardly bee inforced to be a Thankesgiuing, but rather a Doxologie or Recognition of Gods due. 1. *Tim.* 2. 1.

CHAP.

Chap. VII.
Of short Prayers.

N. FRom the Lords Prayer, wee descend to those Prayers which are inuented by men. These be either but *bits of Prayers*, and *short wishes*, rather then *Prayers*: Or drawne into length (called *the Letanie.*) Of the first kind are these: *O Lord open thou our lips. O Lord make haste to helpe vs*, and the like, whose generall fault is their curt breuitie.

I. I remember you were offended at the length of our Liturgie: & now you are displeased at the shortnesse of our prayers? Not vnlike them, which being called Papists, doe answere that they should bee stiled Catholickes: And then being termed Catholickes, thus come vpon vs at the back dooze, that we bee Heretiques, because we contradict them being Catholickes. Or not vnlike children which crie for ycz, and when they haue it, crie because it is cold.

N. Leaue your descants: Though your *Liturgie* bee long: yet some of your Prayers are but cuts, poore pittances, and crummes of Prayers.

I. If these also were inlarged, our Seruice

Booke

Booke would bee longer then a Westphalian mile, or the b yeare of the Cubans. But now to approach to the matter, wee find many short prayers in the Scripture, not exceeding, nay scarce equalling these of ours in length. As for long prayers, besides the Psalmes (which yet are not all of them prayers) wee find not many. In all not aboue nine: whereof three are subdiuided into sundrie Sections (namely that of Abraham, Salomon, and the Lords Prayer.) The other sixe onely seeme to haue continued length. By which it appeares that wee haue sufficient presidents, for both kinds of prayers. Againe, shortnesse of prayer is then most conuenient, when wee intend some greater action of an other nature, and yet holy, or at least lawfull: For this cause, long Grace, by discreete men is not allowed. Lastly these short prayers, are certaine quicke prouocations to ardent Zeale, not vnlike Cæsars briefe Apothegmes.

b Which some haue fabled to contain twentie moneths, each moneth twentie dayes *Gene.*19 20. *Numb.*10.35. *Iosua* 10.12. *Iudg.* 15.18.& 16.28.*Matth.* 26.39.2.*Cor.*13 13.*Gal.*6.18. *Gene.* 18.23. 1.*King.*8.23. 2.*King.*19.15. *Isa.*38.10.*Dan.* 9.2.*Ion.*2. *Hab*,3.*Ioh.*17.

Parce Ciuibus Miles faciem feri.

N. Besides the defect in quantitie: These prayers are also vitious, in regard both of the *person vttering*; and the *matter vttered.* The person vttering is named first a *Priest*: a terme not conuenient to the *Ministers of the Gospell.*

I. Doe you terme our Ministers Euangelicall, being ordained by Bishops; men in your opinion Pettie Popes, and seruants of Antichrist?

N. For the present we grant them to bee true Ministers. For wee contend not about the *substance*, but for the *title.*

I. It

I. It seemeth your altercation is about words, which be the wooll of a Goate.

N. The word Priest is, by Consequence, dangerous: and therefore to be changed.

I. Before you change this tearme; how would you haue these men to be entituled?

N. Let them bee called *Pastors Doctors, Preachers, Ministers, Bishops, Elders.*

I. First, if Pastors be translated Shepheards, you will hardly allow the baseneſſe of that name: Secondly, if Pastors bee turned Feeders; and Doctors, Teachers, how can men, feed or teach, but by preaching? So that your three first tearmes are confounded. The name of Minister is in Greeke all one with Deacon: which after your construction is only conuersant about almes. The stile of Bishop I can proue to bee only proper to him that may ordaine Priests.

N. I will not now be intangled with that controuersie: Wherfore let them bee called *Elders* or *Seniors*; but *Priests* by no meanes.

Deut. 21. 4. *Iudges* 8. 14. *Ruth* 4. 2.

I. First, the name of Elder is giuen by the Hebrewes to the Ciuill Magistrate: and by you to certaine Lay-men, which assist the Pastor in the Consistory: and by vs to men of another qualitie then Priests. For who can be ignorant what bee Aldermen in Townes, and Seniours in Colledges? Secondly, the name Priest, is deduced from the [a] Greeke word, which signifieth Elder. And now tell I pray you

[a] ὁ πρεσβύτερος.

you, why you disallow the tearme Priest?

N. First, because it signifieth a Sacrificer.

I. First, neither is this the proper signification of the word: for in Hebrew it betokeneth a Prince, as well as a Priest: In Greeke, a holy man, or one conuersant about holy things: In Latine, a holy Dowrie: of the English you heard before. Secondly, and though it should signifie a Sacrificer, yet were not the tearme dangerous. For the Priest of the New Testament, doth offer vnto God, the Sacrifice of prayer: and administreth the Sacrament of the Lords Supper, which is also a Sacrifice.

*Gen.*41.45. 2.*Sam.*8.18. Hence the *Tartarians* call their King *Kan* of the Hebrew כהן. *iepeùs* of ἱερός. *Sacerdos* of *Sacer*, and *Dos*. For *Dos* in old time was of the masculine gender.

N. How can this be spoken without *Poperie*, which maketh men to eat *Christ*? A thing more infamous, then either that of the *Caniballs*, where men eate men; or that of the worshippers of *Moloch*, where *God* was thought to eat men: for here man deuoures God.

I. The Romish Sacrifice we allow not: And yet in foure respects, the Sacrament may be termed a Sacrifice. First, because therein we offer our selues to God, as a reasonable Sacrifice: Secõdly, because we present him with ŷ fruit & calues[a] of our lips, the most acceptable sacrifice: 3: For that we giue him the Sacrifice of Almes: Fourthly, & principally because it is the Remẽbrance, Signe, Seale, & Instrument of applying to vs, the only Sacrifice of Christ vpon the Crosse.

a *Rom* 12.1. Some coniecture that the Hebrew word פרים *Hose* 14.3. that is calues was read פרים, that is fruits, *Heb* 13.15.

N. The second cause of our disliking this name *Priest* is, for that the Scripture doth not yeeld it to the *Ministers of the Gospell.* I I.

Esay 66.21.

Mal.1.11.

I. The Prophet calleth them Priests and Leuites.

N. That is only done in the *Old Testament*, by alluſion to the *Priests* of the *Law*: as elſe-where *Prayer* is called *a cleane Sacrifice*, in the like ſenſe.

I. And yet (as euen now you heard) the author to the Hebrewes calleth prayer a Sacrifice: by vertue of this alluſion: whereby alſo the Prophet was moued to call our Miniſters, Priests.

N. This hee did not becauſe they ſhould be ſo ſtiled: but becauſe they ſhould ſucceed them, not in *action* but in *Office*.

I. Not in action? Did not the Priests of the Law both pray, and teach the people? Had they not many of the ſame outward Rites that wee haue (howſoeuer they may ſeeme ſomething to be varied in Circumſtances?) Did not they vſe Water, Bread, Wine; all which notwithſtanding were by Chriſt retained?

N. But you cannot ſhew in the *New Teſtament*, this *name*, in this *meaning*.

1.Pet.2.5.& 9. Apoc.1.6.

I. The name is giuen to all Chriſtians by two Apoſtles: And why ſhould wee denie it to Miniſters, to whom principally it doth appertaine?

N. That name is common to all: and therefore may not be appropriated to them.

I. It may be aſcribed to them, though not properly, yet principally: becauſe they offer to God,

God, not only ſolitary and priuate prayers (as other Chriſtians doe) but euen the publique Supplications of the whole Church. For all true Iſraelites, were by the merits of Chriſt (though to come) made true Prieſts in this generall ſence: and yet this hindred not, but that they of the houſe of Aaron, might bee called Prieſts. *Exod.19.6.*

N. But the *New Teſtament* doth no where attribute directly this name to our *Church Officers.*

I. You ſtill reaſon from negatiue teſtimonies which are but dumbe witneſſes.

N. I reaſon from the practice of the *Euangeliſts* and Apoſtles: which did of purpoſe auoid this name: becauſe the *Legall Prieſthood* and *Temple* were yet ſtanding. In like manner ſhould wee eſchew this tearme becauſe of the *Popiſh Prieſthood.*

I. I hope in Iſaiahs time the Prieſthood and Temple were not abrogated, and yet he called our Miniſters Prieſts. As for the Popiſh Prieſts, they can no more hinder vs from the vſe of this name, then the Prieſts of Tammuz could hinder the Prieſts of Iſrael. Did the Fathers therefore abſtaine from this name, becauſe the Prieſts of Saturne and Iuno were at Carthage, or Iupiter at Rome, Pallas at Athens, and the like?

N. From the *Prieſts* wee come to the *People:* which alſo doe vtter *publique Prayers:* For like *Prieſt*, like *People.*

I I had thought you had beene satisfied when wee treated about the Preface of the Common Prayers.

N. You did then only indeauour to shew that the *People* might say after the Minister, not that they might answer him: The reason and end whereof I cannot conceiue.

I. The end thereof: First, is to ease the Priest: Secondly, to raise vp in the People, memory, attention, and zeale: the first to prepare the minde; the second to make it concurre with the Priest: The third, to apply the Publique sayings to each priuate mans vse.

N. If a good intention might make a good action: the money changers in the Temple might be iustified, which helped the people to the money of the Sanctuary, but where is the warrant of your practice?

I. Our warrant is drawne from proposition: As the Priest would not suffer Dauid and his followers to taste of the holy bread vnlesse they had beene seperate from women, by analogie to Gods Commandements vpon Mount Sinai: So wee cause the People to answer the Priest by a proportionable reference to the practise of Miriam and Anna. Againe, seeing diuers of the Psalmes are prayers: And publique psalmodie is approued by all men of tempered wits: wee know not why the peoples Responsals or answers in praier should be reiected.

1. *Sam.* 21. 4. *Exod.* 19. 15.

Exod. 15. 20, 21 *Luke* 2. 38. Consider the word ἀνθομολογεῖτο.

N.

N. There is no lesse errour in the *matter* then in the *persons*. The first fault of the *matter* is their vsing of *Gloria Patri*, which is but an humane inuention.

I. **Were it so, yet were it tolerable (as we shewed when wee spake of** Set Prayer.) **But true it is that** Athanasius, **a man, inuented it; and** the whole Church **approued it: which (as we thinke) had the** Spirit of God.

N. That whose *first vse* is decayed, ought to be abolished: but the vse of *Gloria Patri* is now decayed (which was to detest *Arrians* and *Macedonians* denying the *God-head* of *Christ*; and of the *Holy Ghost*) now therefore it is to be abrogated.

I. **First, the** Maior **is vntrue: For though** the first vse of the Arke, **were to preserue** Noah **with his Family: yet** Moses **made an** Arke **for another vse: And though** the first vse **of** Manna **were to feed the people, yet it was reserued in the** Golden Pot **many hundred yeares. The like is to bee said of** the Brazen Serpent, **which though it healed not them that looked on it: yet was it kept till the dayes of** Ezekias. **Againe your** Minor **is weake: For at this day we know** (by a certaine migration of soules, or art of Ender) **sundry both** Arrians **and** Samosatenians **and** Trinitaries, Turkes, **and** Iewes, **which doe no lesse impugne the** Trinitie, **then did the** Old Heretiques. **Besides the** Grecians **denying the** Holy Ghost **to proceed from**

תבה an Arke to preserue things aliue. *Gen.6.14.* whence *Thebes* was called by the houses thereof built of *Cadmus* ships. ארון an Arke to keepe things without life. *Exod.25.10.*

I Had thought you had beene satisfied when wee treated about the Preface of the Common Prayers.

N. You did then only indeauour to shew that the *People* might say after the Minister, not that they might answer him: The reason and end whereof I cannot conceiue.

I. The end thereof: First, is to ease the Priest: Secondly, to raise vp in the People, memory, attention, and zeale: the first to prepare the minde; the second to make it concurre with the Priest: The third, to apply the Publique sayings to each priuate mans vse.

N. If a good intention might make a good action: the money changers in the Temple might be iustified, which helped the people to the money of the Sanctuary, but where is the warrant of your practice?

I. Our warrant is drawne from proportion: As the Priest would not suffer Dauid and his followers to taste of the holy bread vnlesse they had beene seperate from women, by analogie to Gods Commandements vpon Mount Sinai: So wee cause the People to answer the Priest by a proportionable reference to the practise of Miriam and Anna. Againe, seeing diuers of the Psalmes are prayers: And publique psalmodie is approued by all men of tempered wits: We know not why the peoples Responsals or answers in praier should be reiected.

1. *Sam.* 21. 4. *Exod.* 19. 15.

Exod. 15. 20, 21 *Luke* 2. 38. Consider the word ἐξομολογεῖτο.

N.

N. There is no lesse errour in the *matter* then in the *person.* The first fault of the *matter* is their vsing of *Gloria Patri*, which is but an humane inuention.

I. Were it so, yet were it tolerable (as we shewed when wee spake of Set Prayer.) But true it is that Athanasius, a man, inuented it; and the whole Church approued it: which (as we thinke) had the Spirit of God.

N. That whose *first vse* is decayed, ought to be abolished: but the vse of *Gloria Patri* is now decayed (which was to detest *Arrians* and *Macedonians* denying the *God-head* of *Christ*; and of the *Holy Ghost*) now therefore it is to be abrogated.

I. First, the Maior is vntrue: For though the first vse of the Arke, were to preserue Noah with his Family: yet Moses made an Arke for another vse: And though the first vse of Manna were to feed the people, yet it was reserued in the Golden Pot many hundred yeares. The like is to bee said of the Brazen Serpent, which though it healed not them that looked on it: yet was it kept till the dayes of Ezekias. Againe your Minor is weake: For at this day we know (by a certaine migration of soules, or art of Ender) sundry both Arrians and Samosatenians and Trinitaries, Turkes, and Iewes, which doe no lesse impugne the Trinitie, then did the Old Heretiques. Besides the Grecians denying the Holy Ghost to proceed from

תבה an Arke to preserue things aliue. *Gen.6.14.* whence *Thebes* was called by the houses thereof built of *Cadmus* ships. ארון an Arke to keepe things without life. *Exod.25.10.*

the Sonne, denie withall (in our opinion) the Sonne's equalitie with the Father, which seemeth to bee acknowledged by this Gloria Patri. Are there not amongst vs many Familists, which are said to disclaime the God-head of the Holy Ghost? Are there not many stiffenecked Atheists, which all in their liues, some in plaine words, denie the Glorie, Trinitie and Eternitie of God, which three things are orderly combined in this Doxologie? Nay, is any man of that trãscendent capacitie, to whom it shal not be auailable to haue this more then Super-celestiall Mysterie often inculcated into his fitting memorie?

N. The words wee might better indure were they not so vnseasonably reiterated at the end of all the *Psalmes*, and sundry *Hymnes*.

I. You complaine (as I heare) that Alleluia (Prayse yee the Lord) is omitted seuenteene times in the end of certaine Psalmes: and yet when we, at the end of euery Psalme, doe most distinctly praise God, (which Alleluia doth enioyne vs to doe) you seeme to be in Choller. Againe the end of this rehearsall is, First, that the ignorant, which cannot reade, may be aduertised where each Psalme endeth: Secondly, that the true vse of Psalmes (which is the praising of God) may bee manifested in practice: Thirdly, That many irreuerent persons by meanes of this (which seemeth to be a kinde of prayer) may bee put in minde of

the

the dutie which is most decent in the hearing of the Psalmes, namely, vailing the Bonnet, which many doe (with as little regard) neglect, as they which depart from Baptisme, before the Thankesgiuing. Of which kinde of Sacrilegious prophaneness, we obserue many lamentable trials among the dissolute multitude.

N. The second fault in the matter of these prayers, is found in these words after *the Apostles Creed, There is none other that fighteth for vs but only thou O God.*

I. Are there not sinnes enow? why make you more? what is the knot in this bulrush?

N. First, you seeme to pray for peace in your owne time, without regarding the posteritie.

I. We pray for the one as being a blessing of God promised to two worthy Kings of Iuda: the latter we neglect not. Only we dare not presume that peace shall remaine with vs with her wings clipt for euer. When we aske bread for this day, doe we neglect to morrow? Doe we not tread as neere as may bee in the steps of Christ, who forbids vs to take care for to morrow? 2. *Kings* 20.19. & 21,10.

N. Againe, when you pray for peace, *because none fighteth for you but God:* you seeme to intimate that you would not feare *warre* if any should fight for you but *God.*

I. This is rather our meaning: That we feare

feare no warre, but expect an eternall peace if God defend vs, who is the Lord of Sabaoth, (that is of Hoasts) At which word in the Te Deum some haue cauilled: not remembring that it is found in the Greeke Text of Saint Paul: For had it beene in the Te Deum: Sabboth not Sabaoth might not that also bee iustified? Did not sundry ancient Iewes terme God, the Lord of the Sabbath Day? Is hee not indeed the Lord of rest, which that word implieth? But to returne from this seeming digression: God is our [a] shield, and [b] watchfull keeper: him only wee haue in Heauen and Earth. And now remember you auouched [c] Michael to bee Christ. Consider the words there written. There is none that holdeth with mee in these things but *Michael* your Prince. If Michael here bee Christ, are not the words the same in effect with these in our Liturgie at which you stumble? In summe, though Angels and Men fight for vs ministerially, and in the nature of instruments; yet God only fighteth as principall Agent, teaching our [d] hands to fight.

Rom.9.29.

a *Psal* 18.2.& 121 4 & 117.1
b *Psal.*73 25.
c *Dan.*10.21.

d *Psal.*18.34.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the Letanie.

N. THe *Short Prayers* being handled, I proceed to the *Letanie*: being *a more continued forme of Prayer*: which (as I take it) doth want things *needfull*, and abound with things *needlesse* or *euill*. First, then it wanteth a *Thankesgiuing*, which is as necessary a part of *Prayer* as *Petition*.

I. If there bee six or seuen Petitions in the Lords Prayer (for there are of both opinions) I beleeue the Lords Prayer will haue the same defect.

N. The conclusion of the Prayer, in these words (*for thine is the Kingdome, &c.*) is a *Thankesgiuing*: so that the prayer is not herein defectiue.

I. I shewed before, that to be no Thankesgiuing: But, if it bee, then is not the Letanie destitute of Prayers in this kinde. For these words, O holy, blessed and glorious Trinitie: and these, O Lambe of God that takest away the sinnes of the world, are they not a direct Doxologie? Haue wee not elsewhere sundrie formes of Thankesgiuing prescribed

both in your larger ſenſe, (as that of Gloria Patri: and that in the beginning of the Goſpell: Glory bee to thee, O Lord; together with Te Deum, Magnificat, Nunc Dimittis, Benedictus, and Benedicite: as alſo in the more ſtrict acception of the word (for example after Baptiſme:) likewiſe in the Communion, in Churching, yea and in Buriall.) Doth not the Church vpon all occaſions (beſides the yearely Solemnities, which are nothing but Thankeſgiuings to God for his benefits in his Sonne, Angels, Saints) appoint many Euchariſticall formes, publiquely to be celebrated? What ſhould I ſpeake of the foure and twentieth of March: and fiue and twentieth of July: the fift of Auguſt, and Nouember; whoſe gratulatory memorials, are obſerued with all Symbols of Chriſtian ioy.

N. But why doe you not ordaine a *continuall Thankeſgiuing* to *God*, whoſe *mercies* are *continuall?*

I. We reade the Pſalmes daily, with ſundry Hymnes of Thankeſgiuing. Beſides, if you ſuppoſe our gratulations ſhould bee as particularly determined as our petitions, you turne Earth into Heauen: In Heauen there ſhall bee an eternall Alleluia, a cauſe or matter of Thankſgiuing: But on Earth, though our wants bee many of them, ſtanding and continued, and ſo our petitions vnalterable: yet the variation of the benefits which wee receiue, doth many wayes diuerſifie the formes of our gratulations.

ons. In prescribing whereof Our Church is not negligent, when new occurrences fall.

N. From the *want* of things *needfull*, I goe on to the *store* of things *needlesse* or *euill*: and that either in the *forme* or *matter*, and *object* of *Prayer*. In the *forme* we dislike these words: *By the mysterie of thy holy Incarnation, &c.* which either wee take to be *Oaths* (things most strange in *Prayer*) or *certaine magicall Exorcismes*, and *Coniurations*: other sence of these words we cannot imagine.

I. You haue at once, hatched foure errours: whereof the two former concerne an oath. The first is, that whersoeuer you heare this word by; you presently conceiue an oath. Whereupon, when you reade these words, by the life of Pharaoh: you coniecture that Ioseph learned to sweare in Egypt by the life of a King: whereas the Hebrew hath simply Pharaoh liues: which phrase notwithstanding sounds but harshly in our English eares: And yet some of your men doubt not to tell the people, that this was an oath. *Gen.42.15,16.*

N. Therein they doe not erre. For did not *Iuda* say to *Iacob: the man charged vs by an oath?* *Gen.43.3.*

I. First, the Hebrew Text may be thus rendred: the man did in contesting, contest, or in protesting protest to vs, that is, hee did charge vs with an earnest protestation. If this sence stand, your oath doth vanish; But because the word may signifie to attest, or call God to witnesse: or to a iure, (that is, to cause another

to sweare) thoughthe ordinary Translation be not changed: yet we may say: that either hee charged them to sweare they would bring Beniamin: or himselfe did call God to witnesse, if they brought not *Beniamin* they should not goe vnpunished? wherefore seeing Charitie craueth the most fauourable exposition; no necessitie doth inforce vs to thinke that Ioseph his saying, by the life of Pharoh was an oath. The second errour is: That you make an Oath and Prayer things repugnant: whereas the two ingredients of an oath (the attestation of God, or calling him to witnesse: and the supplication made vnto him, that he would reueale the truth, and reuenge falshood) are both found in Prayer: wherein wee both call for his presence; and vse many times as well imprecation conditionall, as postulation.

N. What? then would you haue men to sweare when they pray?

I Nothing lesse: But onely by this you see that an Oath and Prayer agree in substance, howsoeuer they seeme to differ in circumstance of termes. Your third errour is, in that you suppose all charging of God by the remembrance of his former benefits to be meere coniuring. Thinke you Dido coniured, when shee said, Per Connubia nostra, that is, By our Marriage I intreat you Æneas to returne to mee?

Æneid.4.

N. I passe not for your *Poeticall instance*.

What

What good conſtruction can you make of theſe words in the *Letanie?*

I. Therein ſtands your fourth error: For the interpretation of the wordes bee plaine: That we deſire God to aide vs: by applying to vs thoſe fifteene benefits there rehearſed, as euery man of meane capacitie may conceiue.

N. From the *forme* let vs goe to the *obiect*: according to which your *Prayers* may be diuided into *Interceſſions* and *Deprecations*. Your *Interceſſions* are three: Firſt, you pray *that God would haue mercie vpon all men*: whereas *Chriſt* would not pray for the world.

I. Chriſt knew the number of the Elect; ſo doe not we: wherefore his example herein is vnimitable. But now (I pray you) conſider this reaſon. Whom God would haue ſaued, for them we may pray that God would ſhew them mercie: But God would haue all men ſaued: wee may therefore pray for his mercie towards all.

Iohn 7.9.

1. Tim. 2.4.

N. Though your *Minor* might be anſwered with thoſe three knowne diſtinctions (Firſt, that God willeth by the will of the ſigne: not of his good pleaſure. Secondly, hee willeth it now: namely, ſince the death of Chriſt. Thirdly, all men: not euery particular man: but men of all orders, to be ſaued:) Neuertheleſſe, your argument may bee thus retorted vpon you: whom God will not ſaue, for mercy towards them wee may not pray: But *God* wils not that all men ſhould be ſaued (for then there ſhould be nore-

The will of the ſigne is whereby God offereth grace in the preaching of the Goſpell. *Acts 17.30.*

probation or vse of Hell) we need not therefore pray thus for all men.

I. Your three distinctions vpon the place of Saint Paul may cleere our Letany: For as God wils all men to be saued: so doe wee pray for his generall mercy. Neuertheleſſe, I thus answer your argument: First, then to let passe your faults in reasoning. Your Maior is ambiguous: For if you meane the secret will of God: put the case your Father were appointed by God, to indure some horrible death: if you notwithstanding should not pray against it, were you not worthy to be lowed in a sacke, with a Cocke, an Ape, a Dogge and a Snake, and so forthwith to be cast into the Sea?

All the Propositions are negatiue: The *Minor* negatiue in the first figure.
So they did in old time to paricides.

N. But I speake of *Gods reuealed will* not of *his secret*. Now God hath reuealed in *his word* that some are *vessels of dishonour*, and cannot be saued.

Rom.9.11.
2.Tim.2.20.

I. Hath God reuealed that hee will not haue all men now liuing to bee saued? As for prayer for the dead, it is repugnant to the doctrine of our Church.

N. Howsoeuer this point shall bee more fully tried in the *Catechisme:* yet it seemes *you pray for the Dead* in your *second Intercession*, wherein you say, *remember not the offences of our forefathers.*

Baruch 3.5.
2.Mac.12.42.

I. Through the sides of the Letanie you strike at Baruch, and the writer of the Macchabees.

N. Wee thinke they all erre alike: seeing they

they defend *Popish Prayers for the Dead.*

1. **What thinke you of the Prayer in the** Psalme: Remember not against vs the former iniquities: **That is** (as Baruch **expoundeth it**) the wickednesse of our Fathers: **which** God **oftentimes visiteth vpon the children. And so** Iudas Macchabeus **prayed,** that the sinne of the slaine men might not bring destruction vpon the whole Army: **as the** sacriledge of Achan **did vpon the hoast of** Ioshua: **and as the sinnes of** Saul, Ieroboam, **and** Achab **brought forth** ripe punishments **in the dayes of** their successours: **For God punisheth the** transgression of the fathers in the children **two wayes: First,** with eternall punishment: **when hee deliuereth** the children **into a** reprobate sense: **that they may imitate their fathers fault, which fault notwithstanding is their owne in regard of** action: **howsoeuer it be imputed to their Parents in respect of** example. **Secondly,** with temporall Chastisement, **although the Children be godly.** *Psal.* 79. 8.

N. The *former iniquities* mentioned in the *Psalme*; may bee expounded of those sinnes, which men that are here brought in praying, had committed before the time of this punishment, and not of the sinnes of their Ancestors.

1. **But is this interpretation against the** analogie **of faith? Doth not God indeed punish the sinne both of the** Fathers **vpon the** children; **and of the** Dead **vpon the** Liuing?

N.

2. Mac. 12. 43, 44.

N. Though this be granted yet *Iudas Macchabeus* cannot be iustified who both *prayed*, and offered a *sinne offerring for the Dead.*

I. Howsoeuer you trust not vs: yet beleeue some, of whose skill and good intention herein you cannot doubt. The summe of the answere is this: Iudas prayed for two things: First, that the offence of the slaine men might not be imputed to his Army? Secondly, Hee intreated for their ioyfull resurrection, charitably hoping that they had in the act of death repented of their sinne. Againe the sinne offering for the dead may be vnderstood Causally, not Subiectiuely: For their sinnes were the cause why it was offered, yet were they not subiects capable of the benefits arising thereby.

Reynolds *de Idololatria.*

N. This shift is cut off by the last wordes of the Chapter, which are these, *that they might bee freed from sinne:* And this clause can be referred to none but the *slaine men.*

I. These words (if they bee not corrupted) as the same author coniectureth (for you know that wee neither hold them Canonicall, nor reade them in our Churches) must be referred to the men in his Armie, which were aliue: Againe, some haue not doubted to answere that sinne may bee forgiuen after this life, Because the full pardon thereof is not declared till the generall iudgement. But now to return to the Letany; Do you thinke that our prayer is popish?

Sir *Edward Hobbie* against *Higgins.*

N.

N. I ſuſpect, that according to the *Papiſts* you thinke the *guilt* to be taken away by *death*, and yet *the puniſhment in Purgatory* to remaine.

I. The Papiſts imagine the guilt of Veniall ſinne only to bee removed by death. Now this ſinne (wherein the Souldiers of Iudas died) was mortall as cannot be denied: Wherefore wee gratifie not the Papiſts in allowing this Hiſtorie. Againe, where is your Charitie, when you charge vs with purgatorie, ſeeing the ſtreame of our Churches Doctrine runneth againſt it.

N. I care not for your *ſtreame*: For you looke *Eaſtward*, and row *Weſtward*: I will now paſſe to the *third Interceſſion*.

I. Before you paſſe; let mee know what you meane by this word Interceſſion?

N. What ſhould I meane but a *Prayer which we make for other men?*

I. When we pray for all men, doe wee not pray for our ſelues? And when wee pray that God would not remember againſt vs, the ſins of Our Forefathers, is not this Prayer made in b halfe of our ſelues: that God would not inflict punishment vpon vs for their tranſgreſſions.

N. I had thought; when you ſaid *all men*: you meant *all but your ſelues*: And that in the *other Prayer* you had beene *Suppliants for the dead*. Now your *third Interceſſion* is *Illuminate*

all Bishops, &c. Pray you herein for *true*, or for *false Bishops?*

I. In your opinion we cannot pray for true Bishops for you imagine true Bishops to bee only ordained by your Discipline which wee haue not. Wch you thinke that you are not bound to pray for men of a contrarie Religion to your owne: But the truth is, wee pray for both: namely, that God would giue the beginning of light to the false, and the increase thereof to the true Bishops.

N. It is vnseasonable now to tell what wee thinke in this point: For I will not at this present bee enwrapt in this question: Only wee thinke that you pray for *Popish Bishops*: Against which I thus reason. For *Antichrist; we may not pray: But Popish Bishops are the seruants of Antichrist: therefore not to be prayed for.*

I. First your Maior is doubtfull to mee: For I beleeue, by Antichrist you meane the Pope.

N. I meane so: what *scruple* is there in it?

I. A scruple which you can neuer remoue: As I will thus confirme. Antichrist is not one man: But a state or succession of men: Now the Pope is only one man: and therefore cannot bee Antichrist. The Maior is affirmed by all Protestants: the Minor is confirmed by common sense.

N. By the *Pope* I meane the *Papacie* or *Succession of Popes*: not *this* or *that* indiuiduall Pope.

I.

I. What then? May we not pray that this Pope that now ſitteth at Rome may bee conuerted, although hee bee in in the ſeat of Antichriſt? May we pray for a Pope, and not for the Popiſh Biſhops? Againe in your Minor you change the Medium; and turne the ſtate of the queſtion: For from Antichriſt, you run to Antichriſt his ſeruants.

N. Betweene *him* and *his ſeruants* there is as much difference as betweene *Hell* and *Gehenna*.

I. Your charitie is too hote, and ſmels of the Brimſtone of that place whereof you ſpeake: Thinke you that Antichriſt can bee ſaued?

N. I thinke hee cannot No more can *his ſeruants*.

I. Can they not relinquiſh his ſeruice, and become Reformed Chriſtians.

N. They may, but then they ceaſe to be his ſeruants.

I. You meane then, That wee may pray for them as Biſhops but not as Popiſh. Now we pray that God would illuminate all Biſhops, that is, deliuer them from the darkneſſe of Poperie, and all manner of errours. Againe, why beate you the buſh in this manner? I know you meane that our Lord Biſhops are Popiſh, and the ſeruants of Antichriſt; Neither can you be ignorant, that for their ſake principally this Prayer is intended.

N. If it be so, I am the more sorrie, except you meane to pray for their conuersion. Howsoeuer it be, I will not now enter into that combat. But from your *Intercession* I make haste to your *Deprecations*: which either concerne things *spirituall* or *temporall*. Of the first kind is this *Prayer*: *From fornication and all other Deadly Sinnes*: wherein you seeme to make *fornication* no sinne.

I. Doe we pray to be deliuered from it as from a Punishment, or as from a Sinne?

N. You made the doubt your selfe. Bee you the *Oedipus*: sure I am, you make it no *sinne* as may thus be proued: *All sinne is deadly* (as no *Protestant* will denie) *But fornication, in your Letanie, is no deadly sinne*; and consequently no sinne. The *Minor* thus appeares, You say; *Fornication, and all other deadly sinnes*: whereby you distinguish *Fornication* from the *other*, as not being of *that kinde*.

I. When Dauid saith, Sheepe and Oxen yea, and the beasts of the field: doth hee exclude Sheepe and Oxen out of the number of the beasts of the field? When Saint Paul saith, As the Apostles and the brethren of the Lord; and Cephas. Doth hee denie the Lords brethren and Cephas to bee Apostles? Doe not the Papists themselues acknowledge Fornication to be one of the Deadly sinnes? And doe you bilisse vs in respect of them?

N. YOu vilifie your ſelues in making *ſeauen deadly ſinnes* like *Papiſts*: which ſome humorous men haue applied to the *ſeuen Planets*, according to the dayes of the weeke: As *Pride* to the glorious *Sunne*: *Enuy* to the pale *Moone*: *Wrath* to fierce *Mars*: *Couetouſneſſe* to ſubtle *Mercurie*: *Glutonie* or *Drunkenneſſe* to prodigall *Iupiter*: *Luſt* to wanton *Venus*: *Sloth* to dull *Saturne*.

I. I diſpute not now whether theſe men did inuent this method, partly for memorie, partly to ſhew that Planets, though they compell not mans minde, yet they incline his affection vnleſſe he breake and taine his naturall diſpoſition. Only this I demand: Doe the Papiſts make no other deadly ſinnes then theſe ſeuen? Is not hereſie with them capitall? Doe they not make ſixe ſinnes againſt the Holy Ghoſt? Preſumption, Deſpaire, Finall Impenitencie, Obſtinate Malice, Inuidence, or Enuie againſt Gods grace in our brother: reſiſting of the knowne truth.

N. Yea your ſelfe made *Enuy*, not long agoe, a *ſinne againſt the Holy Ghoſt*. In a Sermon vpon *Rom.* 1. 29

I. It was then declared, that there is but one ſinne againſt the Holy Ghoſt: and therefore that thoſe ſixe things reckoned by the Schoolmen out of Saint Auſtine, are rather parts then kindes of that ſinne. Alſo it was ſhewed that Enuy was of two kindes. The firſt, whereby one deſireth anothers happineſſe

to

to be translated to himselfe: Another, whereby he is sorrie that any vertue remaineth in the world. This latter is in him that is called the enuious man: and may be a part of that dreadfull sinne against the Holy Spirit.

Matth.13.18.

N. But you said in another Sermon that *Witches* sinne against *the Holy Ghost*.

I. I said it not of my selfe, but recited it out of the Kings Maiesties Booke called the Demonologie: The worthinesse whereof I thought to bee such (though it had beene written by a man vnknowne, or meerely priuate) as might stop all Cauils. But now what can you alleage against it? Doe not some Witches plainly renounce God, and that with a voluntarie and direct obstinacie? Doe they not often blaspheme that God whom they haue known and acknowledged? Can this iniquitie bee distinguished from the sinne against the Holy Ghost.

N. It was affirmed (by them that reported it to vs) that these were your assertions: *Witches* sinne against the Holy Ghost: *Enuy* is the sinne against the Holy Ghost.

I. Men of your profession should be diligent hearers, and slow beleeuers. For you know that Fame is like the vrine, which, till it bee chafed, and tried, is as deceitfull as an Harlot.

N. Well if the *Papists* and *you* make more *deadly sinnes* then *seuen*: why are these *seuen* only reckoned?

I.

I. Let the Papists themselues render a reason of their owne popular diuision: As for vs, wee account all sinne in it owne nature to bee mortall.

N. But you seeme to imply the vulgar *Popish* distribution of *Sinnes* into *Mortall* and *Veniall*.

I. Doe none diuide Sinne in this manner but Papists? Doth not Bellarmine tell you, that Lutherans hold all the sinnes of the Elect to bee veniall: of the reprobate to be mortall? Dare you denie the Publique Doctrine of our Church, that all sinnes (except that against the Holy Ghost) howsoeuer, in their owne nature, they be deadly, yet are made through the merits of Christ, veniall, and pardonable.

Bellar. lib. 2. de peccato.

N. From spirituall things I come to temporall: Whereof both the *number* and *matter* are by vs disliked. Touching the first. The *number* of your *prayers* for *Temporall benefits*, exceedeth them which are made for *Spirituall grates*: whereas of the six Petitions in the *Lords Prayer*, the fourth only is for *Temporall things*.

I. When wee pray in the first Petition: Lead vs not into temptation, against what temptations doe we pray?

N. Temptation is from *God*, either *immediately* and without meanes (as that which is termed the *Diuine temptation*, namely, when *the wrath of God* doth immediatly seize vpon the *Conscience*:) Or else *by meanes*, which are *three*: First, the

the *Deuill* who ſtirres vp the *blaſphemous temptation*: Secondly, *the fleſh*, or part vnregenerate, from which doe iſſue both *the temptations of ſinne*, affrighting the *Conſcience*, and of *Fancie* moleſted with *Melancholy*: Thirdly, the world, by and in which are raiſed *outward temporall afflictions*.

I. I will not now diſpute about your diuiſion: Only you confeſſe, that in this ſixt Petition you pray against temporall affliction, and ſo for a temporall bleſſing. But now tell me I pray you, when in the ſeuenth Petition wee ſay Deliuer vs from euill; what euill is vnderſtood?

N. Theſe words not the *ſeuenth*: but a *part* of the *ſixt Petition*: For *the coniunction But*, knitting them to the former words, doth make them but *one ſentence*, and *one Petition*.

I. By this your reaſon there wil be but foure Petitions: Conſidering to theſe words, Giue vs this day our daily bread, the reſt of the Prayer is annexed by three coniunctions: Namely, twice And, and For. Againe, Beza telleth you, that the word But, is oft times taken for And.

ἀλλὰ for ἀλλὰ καὶ.

N. To grant that theſe words may make *the ſeuenth Petition*: yet by the word *euill*, wee are to vnderſtand *the euill one*, that is the *Deuill*.

I. The word may be put in the neuter gender, and ſo may ſignifie [a] euill, or wickedneſſe: Againe, though wee ſhould receiue your interpre-

a *Matth.5.37. Iohn 5.19.*

ſerpretation concerning the Deuill, were not Iob's afflictions inflicted by the Deuil, meerely temporall? you perceiue then, that here alſo wee pray for temporall ſecuritie. Further I pray you conſider theſe words, forgiue vs our ſinnes: Doe wee in this fift Petition deſire the remiſſion of the guilt of ſinne: or alſo of the puniſhment thereof.

N. I am no *Papiſt* to ſeparate the *puniſhment* from the *guilt?*

I. Are there not temporall, aſwell as eternall punishments of ſinne?

N. What will follow thereupon?

I. That, in this Petition alſo, wee make ſupplication for things temporall. And now retire (if you liſt) to the ſecond Petition: Thy kingdome come. Doe you here vnderſtand the kingdome of power, of glorie, or of grace?

N. The kingdome of grace, as it is exerciſed in the *Church Diſcipline:* erected by *Paſtours, Doctours, Elders, Deacons, Widowes.*

I. Is not this an externall and temporall gouernment? (for I hope it ſhall not laſt in Heauen) doe you not pray for the outward peace of this your Diſciplined Church? Here alſo it is plaine; that for things temporall, this Prayer is tendred. There remaines the firſt Petition (as you call it) Hallowed be thy name: what expoſition thereof doe you giue?

N. Namely; That *Gods name* may be ſanctified by vs; doing his will.

I. If this bee true: the third Petition (Let thy will be done) is meerely void.

N. It may then thus be expounded; *Let thy name bee hallowed in the confusion of the enemies of thy Church.*

I. Doe you desire their eternall, or only their temporall confusion?

N. Wee desire first their *conversion*: then the *repressing* of their *malice*: and for the quiet of the *Church*, wee craue their *temporall ruine*. As for their *everlasting downfall*, wee commit that to the *sole Moderator* of such *dreadfull executions*.

I. Then some thing temporall is requested in this Petition also: So that of the seuen Petitions, all but the third doe in part implore Gods aide aswell for Temporall, as for Spirituall benefits. Further (I pray you) reade Salomons Prayer: wherein of fifteene Petitions, you will hardly make One for things meerely Spirituall.

1. *Kings* 8. 23. & 54.

N. First, the *Iewes* were a *People* much led by sense: and therefore by sensible *Obiects*, to be allured vnto *Religion*: Secondly, although the things prayed for, in shew bee *Temporall*: yet Gods blessing annexed vnto them is *Spirituall*.

I. Our people are no lesse carnall, at least in part: For who hath so much of the spirit as is not in great measure allayed by the flesh? Againe, if your second caution may stand (as indeed it must) remember these two things:

First,

First, that the fourth Petition craueth Contentment and Gods blessing, in the attainment, vse, and losse of the things of this life: which you cannot but agnize to bee Spirituall: Secondly, that the Prayers in our Letanie, may admit the like construction. Further your argument may be answered, two other wayes: First, that all the suites that wee present to God for temporall things, may easily be reduced to the fourth, sixth, and seuenth Petitions: Secondly, these are but one and twentie in number, whereas our Prayers for things spirituall, are in a manner numberlesse.

N. Wee insist not so much vpon the *number*, as vpon the *matter* of these *Prayers*: and specially of *two of them*: First, you pray against *Lightning* and *Tempest*: whereas *Lightning* is but rare in *Winter*.

I. We pray not simply against Lightning. (For we know it to bee a Meteor, very beneficiall in nature) but against the damage arising thereby, which is in the Winter more perillous; because lesse vsuall. Againe, (according to the ancient diuision of the yeare, into Summer and Winter) we pray against the dangers of the whole yeare: Namely, against Lightning most frequent in Summer, and tempest in Winter. Or thus, against Lightning most terrible in Winter; and Tempest in Summer.

N. The *second errour* in the *matter* of your *Prayer*, is: That you pray *to bee deliuered from*

ſuddaine Death. This to bee defectiue, I thus proue. *Againſt that which ought not to bee in the Elect, we ought not to pray: But Death ought not to be ſuddaine to the Elect:* (who ſhould rather be prepared and awaite for it,) *wee ought not therefore to pray againſt ſuddaine Death.*

The *Minor* negatiue in the firſt figure: and all the reaſon ſtanding vpon negations: nor indeed being capable of amendment.

I. Although it were more fit for you to licke your reaſon as a Beare doth her whelpes (for as yet it is all ſhapeleſſe.) Neuertheleſſe I denie your Maior vpon this reaſon. Againſt that which ought not to bee in the Elect, wee ought not to pray: But ſinne ought not to bee in the Elect: Againſt ſinne therefore wee may not pray.

N. To let this paſſe, I come to another Argument: *That, againſt which wee pray is either a ſinne, or a Iudgement: But ſuddaine Death is neither* (for it hath befalne the Elect.) *In vaine therefore doe you pray againſt it.*

I. If you imagine that no ſin hath befalne the Elect; you will ruſh vpon the Libertine errour of Coppyn and Quintaine, two Belgian Coblers; which patched vp this opinion, that ſinne in the Elect is but imaginarie.

N. You traduce mee. I brought it, to proue that it is no *Iudgement.*

I. In the former reaſon you ſaid it ought not to be in the Elect: and now you auouch it to bee no ſinne: How will you ſolder theſe things together?

N. Howſoeuer it may bee a *ſinne*: yet

it is no *iudgement* to the *Elect.*

I. Though it bee no iudgement, May we not pray aswell against sinnes, as against iudgements? But why is it no iudgement?

N. Because it doth befall the *Elect*, which no *iudgement* doth.

I. Why then doth the Apostle [a] say, Iudgement doth begin at the house of God? Againe is it not lawfull to pray for a comfortable Death? Is it not some comfort to die with renewed Faith, Repentance, Reconciliation, and Setting of the house in order? Lastly, is not Suddaine Desolation, a iudgement threatned to the [b] wicked?

N. But there is no [c] *condemnation* to the *Elect.*

I. Yet some of them die with more scandall, and lesse ioy of conscience, yea and enioy lesse ioyes in Heauen then others of their brethren: and may not wee pray for the best gift.

a 1. *Pet.* 4. 17. Reade more of this in the last Booke of the Bishop of *Winchester* against *H. I.*

b *Prou.* 1. 27.

c *Rom.* 8. 1.

CHAP.

Chap. IX.

Of Hymnes.

N. From your ordinarie Prayers in *Prose*, wee come to your *Hymnes*: which wee disallow both for *forme* and *matter*. Touching the *forme*: wee like not your *Church Musique*, Vocall, and Instrumentall: Against which some haue thus reasoned: *Musique was inuented by* Iubal, *One of the wicked stocke of* Caine: *and therefore not to be vsed in the Church.*

Gen. 4. 21.

I. Touching the Antecedent, I demand first, How you proue that hee inuented Musique?

N. He is said to bee *the Father of all that play vpon the Harpe and Organs*: vnder which words *all kindes of Instrumentall Musique* are comprehended.

I. To grant that (which yet you can neuer euict:) yet the word Father doth not signifie an Inuenter: For in the former verse Iubal is said to be the Father of cattle, that is, of feeding cattle: Did not Abell keepe sheepe before him?

N. But here are meant *greater cattle*: or else

that

that he perfected *the art of Shepheards*, begunne by *Abel*.

I. The force of the word, will not establish the first, considering it signifieth Possession, which may agree alwell to Sheepe and Goats as to Oxen and Horses. As for the latter, though it bee not credible, that Abel should want art, yet to grant it: By this you perceiue that Iubal did not inuent, but adorne it. The like is to bee said of Iubals Musique. For you shall neuer perswade that a liberall art was inuented by a man. Secondly, did Iubal inuent Church Musique?

Peculium à Pecudibus dictum. Vnde & peculari & peccare.

N, No: But if he, being of the cursed race of *Caine*, did inuent it, we may not vse it in the *Church*.

I. This is your olde sandie consequence: vpon which you built your first generall obiection: But did not Anah finde out Mules? and yet neither Dauid, nor Salomon refused to vse them. Are therefore tents vnlawfull or the feeding of cattle: or the workes in Iron & Brasse: because the two first (as you expound it!) were inuented by Iubal, and the two latter by Tubal Caine?

Genes. 36. 24. *Deut.* 22. 10. 1. *Kings* 1. 33.

N. *Things done in the Ceremoniall Law, are to be abolished: But such was Church Musique*: Ergo.

I. Ballance the wordes of your Maior. Was not saying and reading vsed in the Ceremoniall Law? Will you haue these also abrogated?

N.

N. These things did concurre with it, but were not *parts* of it, as was *Musique.*

I. Then is your Minor but a broken reed: As may thus be proued. All parts of the Ceremoniall Law were set downe by *Moses:* Now Church Musique was not ordained by *Moses:* But by *Dauid* and *Salomon:* And therefore not Ceremoniall.

N. Your *Maior* seemes to want weight: For *Salomon* not *Moses* did erect the *Temple:* and yet I trust you will not denie it to bee a part of the *Ceremoniall Law.*

I. The Temple was but the Standing Tabernacle inlarged; and so in substance all one with it.

N. Church Musique doth not edifie: and therefore to be disallowed.

I. Touching your antecedent, I demand first. What Musique you intreat of? Doe you dislike all singing in the Church: which some of the Separation haue termed the croking of Rauens?

N. No: but your *artificiall Musique*, which because it is not vnderstood doth not edifie.

1.*Cor.*14.26. *Ephes.*5.19. *Col.*3.16.

I. Secondly, then I demand: Did you euer heare of Musique that was not artificiall? were not the Psalmes and Hymnes (mentioned by Saint Paul) made by art, or that which is aboue art (namely the spirit of Prophecie.) If your vulgar Psalmodie bee good (as no doubt it is) how much more excellent shall your

your Artificiall Musique be: which also is so plaine, that euery man of meane diligence and capacitie may conceiue it with reuerend delight. And now let mee aduertise you of your double contradiction to your selfe: First, you said that Musique was not lawfull in the Church, because it was inuented by Iubal: and yet after made it a part of the Ceremoniall Law, and could not denie the vse thereof by Dauid and Salomon: Secondly, yet stumbling againe, you auouch that it doth not edifie: As if any part of the Law Ceremoniall, or any thing instituted by Dauid and Salomon, were such as could not tend to edification.

N. Musique did edifie *then*, but not *now*.

I. You should haue produced some reason of your assertion: Meane time wee had rather beleeue Athanasius in the East, Ambrose in the West: Augustine in the South (which did partly erect, partly allow Church Musique) then your bare spirit of Contradiction.

N. Saint *Paul* shewes that *Musique* cannot edifie, because the vulgar knowes not what is piped. 1. *Cor.* 14.7.

I. First, the Apostle speaketh of a Pipe, in whose sound there is no distinction: Secondly, of such a Pipe, he saith, how shall it be knowne what is piped? His meaning is, how shall the most expert Musician know the meaning thereof? Now can you charge our Musique with indistinction of sounds.

1. Cor. 14. 11. *Barbarus hic ego sum quia non intelligor vlli.*

N. Your *Musique* is *indistinct* being *barbarous*: And that so it is, it appears by the *Apostle* in the same place, because the multitude doth not vnderstand it.

I. Doth not the multitude conceiue that the words of Te Deum are sung or some such like Hymne?

N. But they cannot vnderstand the *Musicall Proportions*: and so the *Musique* doth not edifie.

I. If you meane an exact vnderstanding, some will doubt whither any Musician hath it, being a matter of so deepe contemplation: But if you conceiue a confused and general knowledge, this may not bee denied to the multitude.

N. I meane a *competent vnderstanding of Musique*, without which no man can iudge thereof.

I. Though it require much skill to iudge: yet a mediocritie of Science will serue to bee delighted, and thereupon to giue a certaine confused iudgement. For there is a naturall sympathy betweene mans soule and melodie. Now obserue, if your argument were good, then the vulgar might not heare a Sermon, because they cannot distinctly iudge of the method, and ornaments thereof; being taken from the Armorie of Logique, and Wardrobe of Rhetorique: nor of the truth of the Citations which are drawne from Hebrew, Chaldee,

Syrian, and Greekish fountaines: And thus in stead of Church Musique, you would abrogate Sermons, especially before the multitude. In summe; As God loueth a cheerefull giuer, so much more a cheerefull worshipper. So that Musique is requisite that deuotion may be refreshed by delectation. And take this for a Maxime, An enemie to Musique, an enemy to Muses.

N. From the *forme* wee come to the *matter* of *Hymnes:* which are either *taken out of Scripture*, or *inuented by man:* Of the first kinde are these; *Magnificat, Benedictus, Nunc Dimittis:* wherein wee first disallow; that being vttered at the beginning vpon *a particular occasion*, they are now conuerted to *a common vse.* *Luke* 1.46. & 68. & 2.29.

I. First, If that were true: What thinke you of the Epistles of Saint *Paul* to the Galathians, and to Philemon, being written vpon most speciall, and vrgent necessities?

N. There are contained in them, most *Oecumenicall doctrines* for the *vniuersall good* of the *Church.*

I. The same may be said of those Hymnes (as you tearme them) for indeed it may bee doubted, whither things taken out of the Scriptures be Hymnes: Forasmuch as properly they be termed Hymnes which be inuented by the art of Ecclesiasticall men. Secondly, you will hardly alledge any particular occasion of these Songs, especially of the two former.

N. But of the last wee may: For *Simeon*

desired to die, because hee had seene *Christ*.

I. Hee desired to bee dismissed in peace, because he had seene Gods promise fulfilled: And so may wee desire to be with Christ, vpon the acknowledgement of his reuealed will in the Gospell.

N. The *second thing* that we dislike i; That these *Psalmes* are more often repeated, then the *Psalmes of Dauid*.

Luke 7. 28. I. You know it is written: That the least in the Kingdome of Heauen is greater then *Iohn* the Baptist: So we say, That the Songs of the New Testament, are greater and more to our edification, then those of the Old Couenant, because they conteine the Gospell, which is both a greater and a neerer light.

N. Wee will speake more of the *Magnificat*, when wee come to treate of the *translations*. The second *kinde* of *Hymnes* was inuented *by men*: As *Te Deum*, and *Benedicite*: wherein *first* we dislike that *mens inuentions* should bee obtruded vpon the *Church*.

I. Why set you before vs twice sodden Coleworts? Set Prayers to bee lawfull wee haue proued before. Now Hymnes inuented by men are nothing but Set Prayers: And therefore lawfull.

N. In the *Te Deum* wee dislike those words *When thou hadst ouercome the sharpnesse of death, thou didst open the Kingdome of Heauen to all beleeuers*. Whereby wee suspect you meane that

Christ

Christ after his death, deliuered the *Fathers* from *Limbus*, from which time all beleeuers immediatly enter into *Heauen*.

I. Did not Christ first goe into Heauen to prepare a place for vs, as saith the Scripture?

Iohn 3.13. & 14.2. *Heb* 9.8.12. & 11.40.

N. Hee went thether first not *actually*, but *virtually*: because hee merited our going thether.

I. Did hee merit it by any other meanes, then by the vertue of his Death, Resurrection, and Ascention?

N. Hee did not: But we feared some Snake, lurking vnder this grasse.

I. I leaue your iealous suspitions: Forasmuch as you know that Lymbus Patrum is generally reiected by Our Church.

CHAP. X.

Of Collects, and Creeds.

N. I Should speake of the *Benedicite*, but that it is amongst the *Apocryphall Bookes*: and therefore it shall be deferred till we speak of the *Lessons*: Now from the *Ordinarie Prayers* wee proceed to the *Collects*: whereof the most be *extraordinary*. But in the fore-

forefront of them we will place the *third Collect* for *Grace* being also an *ordinarie Praier*: and taking part of both: wherein wee approue not these words (*Grant that this Day wee fall into no sinne.*) Against which we thus reason: *It is vnpossible, that wee fall into no sinnes*: And therefore to pray for it vtterly vnlawfull.

I. Your Antecedent is ambiguous, as may thus appeare. Not to sinne is possible: But to fall into no sinne, is all one with not to sinne: and therefore possible. The Maior is proued by Saint Iohn who saith, hee that is borne of God, sinneth not: neither indeed can sinne. 1. *Iohn* 3.9.

N. That place admitteth sundry good expositions: As *first*, the regenerate cannot *finally* fall into sinne: *Secondly*, no not *totally* for a time: *Thirdly*, a man, *so farre forth as hee is regenerate* cannot sinne, but only *in regard of the flesh*, which *lusteth* against the *spirit*.

I. Which-soeuer of these interpretations you apply to this place; there may be sufficient iustifications to the words of the Collect especially the two former: For it is very lawfull for vs to pray, that wee may neither finally nor totally for a time, fall into sinne: That is, (as the Prophet saith) that wee may bee kept from sinnes presumptuous: Againe; this truth may be thus manifested: Not to bee led into temptation is possible: But not to fall into sinne, is all one in effect with not to bee led into temptation: *Psal.* 19.3.

tation: And therefore equally possible.

N. Your *Minor* seemes to reele: For a man *may bee led into temptation*; and yet not *fall into sinne:* For *Christ sinned not:* and yet *was led into temptation.*

I. The speech were blasphemous, were it not vttered of ignorance: For to bee led into temptation is to be carried into the midst thereof, and to bee ouercome by it: which (as you know) cannot agree to Christ. This exposition may thus bee proued: Either wee pray that wee may not bee led into temptation: or that wee may not yeeld to temptation: The latter to bee lawfull no man doubts: But the former I hope you will not auer. It remaines therefore: That the scope of the Prayer is, that wee may not bee surprised with temptation, so that it may occasion vs to fall into any crying and habituall sinne.

N. There bee other *Proper Collects*, at whose words and doctrine wee are offended: The *first Defect* in the words is *obscuritie.*

I. By this argument you might condemne many of the Psalmes: which though they bee meere Prayers: yet in many places are as obscure as truth, which is hidden in Democritus pit: But what is the obscuritie which you pretend.

N. In the *Collect* vpon *Trinitie Sunday* (as you terme it.) These words are as darke as the leaues of *Sibilla: (and in the power of the Maiestie) to worship the vnitie.*

I. No

I. No maruell in a matter as profound as Hell, if some phrase be not so cleere: For if a man should demand of you, the difference betweene the generation of the Sonne, and the proceeding of the Holy Ghost? Or how the Sonne should be called a Distinct Person, and yet be in his Father: Or how the Father should communicate all his being to his Sonne; and yet continue his owne being distinct from that of his Sonne. Or how the Father by the Sonne should actiuely breath out the Holy Spirit? Or how the wisdome of God should differ from his iustice (considering in God there can bee admited no composition) I beleeue though you had the aid of all Phralogistes, you would hardly reconcile and explaine these phrases; which notwithstanding are receiued in the Church, as most necessarie. But as for the difficultie, at which here you stumble, it is of no moment: For it is plaine that we worship the Vnitie of the Three Persons in the power of the Diuine Maiestie, acknowledging them Three to be one in powerfull Maiestie, or Maiesticall power, according to a vulgar [a] Hebraisme knowne to children.

a Hest. 1. 4. & 7. Acts 8. 23.

N. There are some other words, in shew dangerous: as first the tearme of *Penance* in the *Collect* vpon *Iohn Baptists* day.

I. Either Penance is an old word, signifying Repentance: or else it betokeneth the Ecclesiasticall Absolution which is giuen to men that shew the signe of penitence. *N.*

N. The former signification is vncertaine: Of the latter wee will reason in *the Visitation of the sicke*. Your second perillous terme is that of *Chances* in the *first Collect* after *the Offertorie*: Whereas this name *Chance*, howsoeuer it bee vsed by the *Heathen Philistim Priests*: yet is it not found in *Scriptures* taken vp by the *Godly*. And no maruell, seeing by this word the *Prouidence of God* is denied: and our *ignorances* of *second Causes* proclaimed.

1.*Sam.*6.9.

I. This tearme is taken vp by Christ himselfe, where hee saith, that by chance there came a Priest. Now for the denying of God's prouidence, it is vntrue, Chance being either meere or mixt. Meere Chance derogateth from the all-seeing prouidence of God: so doth not mixt chance: For although all things bee most certainly appointed, and foreseene by God: yet he ordaineth some second causes to bee vnfallible: some to be mutable and contingent. This is most manifest in the will of man, which though it bee not free from the necessitie of infallibilitie, (whereby the secret operation of God, doth bow it to what side of the ballance he will) yet is it most free from the necessitie of Coaction. So that our actions, howsoeuer conditionally they bee necessary (namely in regard of God's Decree) yet absolutely in their owne nature they proceed from a cause contingent, and changeable.

Compare συγχυρίαν. *Luke* 10.31. with the verse of *Empedocles* cited by *Aristotle*, *Phis. Lib.* 2. *cap.*4.

N. By this you perceiue that by GODS

I. Do maruell in a matter as profound as Hell, if some phrase be not so cleere: For if a man should demand of you, the difference betweene the generation of the Sonne, and the proceeding of the Holy Ghost? Or how the Sonne should be called a Distinct Person, and yet be in his Father: Or how the Father should communicate all his being to his Sonne; and yet continue his owne being distinct from that of his Sonne. Or how the Father by the Sonne should actiuely breath out the Holy Spirit? Or how the wisdome of God should differ from his iustice (considering in God there can bee admited no composition) I beleeue though you had the aid of all Phratologistes, you would hardly reconcile and explaine these phrases; which notwithstanding are receiued in the Church, as most necessarie. But as for the difficultie, at which here you stumble, it is of no moment: For it is plaine that we worship the Vnitie of the Three Persons in the power of the Diuine Maiestie, acknowledging them Three to be one in powerfull Maiestie, or Maiesticall power, according to a bulgar [a] Hebraisme knowne to children.

a Hest. 1. 4. & 7. Acts 8. 23.

N. There are some other words, in shew dangerous: as first the tearme of *Penance* in the *Collect* vpon *Iohn Baptists* day.

I. Either Penance is an old word, signifying Repentance: or else it betokeneth the Ecclesiasticall Absolution which is giuen to men that shew the signe of penitence. *N.*

N. The former ſignification is vncertaine: Of the latter wee will reaſon in *the Viſitation of the ſicke.* Your ſecond perillous terme is that of *Chances* in the *firſt Collect* after *the Offertorie*: Whereas this name *Chance*, howſoeuer it bee vſed by the *Heathen Philiſtim Prieſts*: yet is it not found in *Scriptures* taken vp by the *Godly*. And no maruell, ſeeing by this word the *Prouidence of God* is denied: and our *ignorances* of *ſecond Cauſes* proclaimed. 1.*Sam.*6.9.

I. This tearme is taken vp by Chriſt himſelfe, where hee ſaith, that by chance there came a Prieſt. Now for the denying of God's prouidence, it is vntrue, Chance being either meere or mixt. Meere Chance derogateth from the all-ſeeing prouidence of God: ſo doth not mixt chance: For although all things bee moſt certainly appointed, and foreſeene by God: yet he ordaineth ſome ſecond cauſes to bee vnfallible: ſome to be mutable and contingent. This is moſt manifeſt in the will of man, which though it bee not free from the neceſſitie of infallibilitie, (whereby the ſecret operation of God, doth bow it to what ſide of the ballance he will) yet is it moſt free from the neceſſitie of Coaction. So that our actions, howſoeuer conditionally they bee neceſſary (namely in regard of God's Decree) yet abſolutely in their owne nature they proceed from a cauſe contingent, and changeable. Compare συγχυρίαν. *Luke* 10.31. with the verſe of *Empedocles* cited by *Ariſtotle, Phiſ. Lib.* 2.*cap.*4.

N. By this you perceiue that by GODS

Decree, there can bee no *Chance*.

I. There are two degrees of Gods Decree: First, generall, whereby hee decreeth things in their owne absolute nature to be contingent, and free. Secondly, more speciall, whereby he determineth the indifferencie and contingencie of things, enclining them according to his owne good pleasure. In regard of the former, Chance may, and must be allowed; not only in respect of the second causes (as the common opinion runneth) but euen in regard of Gods Determination, the first cause of the being of all things.

N. Besides *words*, we blame *Doctrine* intimated in your *Collects*: The first whereof is, the *Doctrine of Merit*, insinuated in these words vpon *Ashwednesday*, or the *First Day in Lent* (*that we worthily lamenting our sinnes, and knowledging our wretchednesse, may obtaine of thee, the God of all mercie, perfect remission and forgiuenesse.*) Here, the *cause* of the *pardon* of *sinnes* is made to bee our *lamentation* for them, and *acknowledgement* of *them*.

I. It is not the cause, but the concurrent, concomitant, or rather antecedent, thereof: and that not for the purchasing of it, but of the assurance of the same to our consciences. For although the forgiuenesse of our sinnes be in nature before repentance (whereof the things named in the Collect are effects and signes:) Neuertheless in regard of apprehension thereof (which

which some call Certioration) it doth oft times follow the same. Tell me; when Christ said, Many sinnes are forgiuen her, because she loued much; Did he make her loue, the cause of the remission of her sinnes? S

Luke 7.47.

N. No, but rather the contrary; For he maketh her to *loue much*, because her manifold sins were pardoned: So that *her loue* was an effectuall *signe* not an efficient *cause* of the condonation of her iniquities.

I. The like may bee said of those thinges which are mentioned in the Collect.

N. Nay, but you make forgiueneſſe of *sinnes* to be obtained by these things.

I. Did not Elias obtaine the restraint of raine by Prayer?

1. *Kings* 17.1. *Iames* 5.17.

N. Not by the merit of his owne *Prayer*: but for that his *Prayer* issued from *faith*, which apprehended CHRIST: vpon whose merit all the efficacie of *Prayer* doth depend.

I. So our Lamentation, &c. proceedeth from Repentance; Repentance issueth from Faith; Faith layeth hold vpon Christ: of whose onely merit, all the force of our lamentation, and Confession of sinnes dependeth. And what is all this to Popish Merit? If your iealousie did not prouoke you to coine vnthought of errours in our Liturgie.

N. The second is the *Doctrine* of *Desspaire*, which you manifest in two *Collects*: First, in that vpon the twelfth *Sunday* after *Trinitie*, in these

words *giuing to vs that that our prayer dare not presume to aske*: Secondly, in the *fift Collect* after the *Offertorie*: *Those things which for our vnworthinesse we dare not, and for our blindnesse we cannot aske, vouchsafe to giue vs*: In both which wee espie a double fault: First, a *contradiction*: for you pretend *that you dare not aske* and yet *doe aske*.

I. What thinke you of that contradiction? I beleeue, Lord, helpe my vnbeliefe?

Marke 9.24.

N. It is only in appearance, For he might in a *confused generalitie* beleeue that the *Messias* was able to performe this *Miracle*, and yet in *distinct specialtie* did not beleeue that *this Iesus* was the *Messias*: Or else, he might doubt, because he had no *particular promise*: howsoeuer he beleeued *Gods Vniuersall Power and Goodnesse*: Or lastly, he might distrust in regard of his owne *vnworthinesse*; and yet conceiue no *scruple* of *Christ's potent mercie*.

I. So may we aske that of God through Christ, which wee dare not craue when wee consider our owne vnworthinesse; looking downe (like the Swan or Peacocke) to our foule feet.

Pro.28.1. Ephes.3.12. Heb.4.16.

N. The *second fault* offensiue is, that you renounce that *boldnesse*, and *confidence* which *Salomon*; Saint *Paul*, and the *Authour to the Hebrewes* doe commend.

I. Why? was not Saint Paul the Authour to the Hebrewes?

N.

N. We ſhall reaſon of that in *Matrimonie*: returne therefore to your *argument*.

I. The ſame Salomon then that aſcribeth the boldneſſe of Lions to righteous men, doth elſewhere pronounce him bleſſed that feareth alwayes: And the ſame Apoſtle, which exhorteth vs to confidence, doth charge vs to finiſh our ſaluation with feare and trembling: for wee may bee bold in regard of God's endleſſe mercie, and yet feare in a double reſpect: Firſt, with the feare of reuerence, which cauſeth the Angels to couer their faces with their wings: Secondly, with a feare of Gods diſpleaſure, vpon the deepe conſideration of our owne indignitie, in regard of our manifold tranſgreſſions, partly ſecret, partly breaking out vpon the leaſt occaſion. By the firſt wee doe weigh our owne infirmitie, as wee are creatures: by the latter our vilitie, as we are Sinners, and haue the fleſh mingled with the ſpirit. Beſides this caution which is plainly expreſſed in the latter Collect in theſe words, which wee for our vnworthineſſe dare not: whereby wee intimate, that yet we dare through the Dignitie of Chriſt. There is yet an other clauſe in the former Collect, namely, in theſe words, which our Prayer dare not preſume; whereby all ſcruple is remoued. For you that talke ſo much of the ſpirit of Prayer; will you reckon Preſumption among the vertues thereof?

Prou. 28. 14.

Phil. 2. 12.

Iſa. 6. 2.

N. No, but we reckon it among your *vices*

that

that make *confidence presumption*: For to craue what *God* in *Christ* hath promised is no *presumption*, but *confidence*: and to doubt thereof is *Diffidence* not *Humilitie*.

I. To doubt in reguard of Christ is diffidence: but to make a demurre in reguard of our owne imbecilitie is true lowlinesse.

N. From the *Peoples Prayers*, wee come to the *Confessions* vttered in the three *Creeds*: that of the *Apostles*, the *Nicen*, and the *Athanasian*. The matter whereof howsoeuer wee allow: yet first we dislike that you vse the often rehearsall of them: and seeme to equalize them to the *Canonicall Scripture*.

2. *Tim.* 1.13. *Heb.* 6.1. I. Wee hold it expedient oft to rehearse the patternes of wholsome words and doctrines of the beginning of Christ: and these Symboles wee place next the Scriptures: not onely because they are extracted out of them; or by reason of their Antiquitie, (the first of them being penned either by Apostles or Apostolique men) but in part also for their perspicuitie and perfection ioyned with breuitie: the vtilitie whereof is now discouered by miserable experience. For the Grecians at this day by reason of their bondage vnder the Turkes, being not able to trauell much in Scriptures, or other Learning, haue only these ancient Symboles left them; as arguments for their iudgement; and Monuments for their faith.

N. Secondly, wee doe principally dislike.

That

That the *Creed of the Apoſtles* is reherſed by the *Miniſter* and *People* ſtanding.

I. Concerning the Peoples anſweres, I haue ſpoken before, both in the Preface and Short Prayers.

N. Yea, but what reaſon can you render, why the *People* ſhould *ſtand?*

I. The ancient cauſe thereof was, That men might ſhew their readineſſe to profeſſe their faith, when they were to ſtand before perſecuting Iudges. But now there is an other reaſon of great vſe, Namely, to aduertiſe the people, that this is A Creed and not A Prayer: for then kneeling were more conuenient then ſtanding: whereas commonly Children take it for a Prayer by tradition from their ignorant Elders.

In the fift and ſeuenth Chapters.

1. *Pet.* 3. 15. compared with *Mat.* 10. 18 & 1. *Tim.* 6. 13. Conſider the difference betweene ἐγγὺς and ἐσὼς in *Luke* 18. 11. & 13. *illic ſitus, hic diſtantia notatur.*

Chap. XI.

Of God's ſpeech in the Liturgie.

NOw the *ſpeech* of the *people* to *God* (vttered in *Prayer* and *Confeſſion*) wee aſcend vp to the *ſpeech* of *God himſelfe* to the *people*: declared partly in the *Ten Commandements*, partly by *their ſanction*: and that either by *threatning* or *commination*: or by *inſtruction* which is offered, either to the *younger ſort* (in *Catechiſme*) or to the *Elder* (in *Homilies*)

In the rehearſall of the *Ten Commandements*, theſe words are omitted *which brought thee out of the land of* Egypt, *out of the houſe of* [a] *bondage*? Againſt which, thus I reaſon? No part of *Gods Law may be omitted: But theſe words are a part of the Law, and therefore not to be omitted.*

a Or bondmen. *Deut.4.2.& 12.32. Pro.30.6. Apoc.22.18.*

I. The proofes of your Maior are impertinent: and ſo commonly the men of your condition do vſe to lade their Margins with Texts of Scripture, as men doe Cammels till they crie. For whereas theſe Scriptures doe forbid omiſſion in practice, or interpretation at the moſt, you apply them to reproue omiſſion in rehearſall: But now confirme your Minor, and all ſhall be granted.

N.

N. First, the *Hebrewes* point these words as they doe the *Commandements:* and number the *letters* of them among the sixe hundred fiftie three *letters* of the [b] *Law.* Secondly, they seeme to bee the *affirmatiue part* of the *first Commandement:* whereby we are (by *implication*) charged to haue, and acknowledge the true *God.*

I. Parts of the Commandements are of two kindes. Substantiall and Circumstantiall (called Sanctions.) The Substantiall part, wee finde omitted in the rehearsall of the Tenth Commandement vsed by Saint [c] Paul. For I beleeue that these words, thy neighbours house, thy neighbours wife, &c. declaring the obiects of concupiscence, cannot be denied to be essentiall parts of the precept. As for the Sanction, we finde it left out in the repetition of the fift [d] Commandement: for so these words are accounted that thy dayes may be long in the land, &c. Now your first Argument doth only inforce these words to be a Sanction, or proeme of the Precept, considering the Sanctions of the second, fourth, and fift Commandements, are so pointed by the Hebrewes (although with a difference:)

N. It may seeme strange that the *second Commandement*, and the *three following* should haue *Sanctions* annexed; and the *first* bee destitute thereof.

I. The ratifications adioyned to them doe follow them: But the confirmation (for which

b In the fiue Bookes of *Moses* are found written 653. Commandements, namely, 288. affirmatiues (according to the ioynts of the body) and 365. negatiues (according to the dayes of the yeare:) Reade for these *Phillip Ferdinando* the *Iew.*

c *Rom.*13.9.

d *Math.*19.

you contend) doth come before the first Commandement. And therfore your argument hath no fit proportion. Again this Sanction may be generall to the whole Decalogue: Neither can you necessarily proue it to be appropriate to the first precept: And though it it were peculiar to the same, yet why may it not bee omitted in the repetition? especially so farre forth as it particularly concerneth the Children of Israel, which only were freed from the iron furnace of Egypt.

N. We are also deliuered from the *Spirituall Egypt* of *Sinne* and *Poperie*. So that for *this reason* likewise it should be mentioned.

Apoc. 11.8.

I. When Moses repeateth the Law, the second time, he omitteth the sanction of the fourth Commandement, which was added to it in the first promulgation thereof: Namely, Gods rest after the six dayes of Creation: and in place thereof doth put the deliuerance from Egypt: by which we obserue two things: First, that all Sanctions are not of necessitie to be inculcated in the repetition of the Law: Secondly, that this confirmation drawne from the Deliuerance out of Egypt, doth pertaine as well to the fourth, as to the first Precept. Besides when Saint Paul doth rehearse the fift Commandement, instead of the Land of Canaan hee nameth the Earth, because Canaan was peculiar to the Hebrewes. In like proportion, howsoeuer Egypt may spiritually signifie Sinne; Po-

Exod 20.1.
Deut. 5.15.

Ephes 6.3.

pery,

pery, or rather Hell: yet because we haue promises of a better Testament, we may omit the mention of Egypt, according to the saying of the Prophet. Your second argument is ouerthrowne by the first. For if these words bee therefore part of the Commandements, because they are pointed like them (I meane as a Sanction may be tearmed a part accidentall) then may they not bee stiled the affirmatiue part of the first Commandement, because they are not pointed like the Fourth and Fift, which are counted affirmatiue Precepts. Besides where will you finde a Commandement, wherein the affirmatiue and negatiue part are both expreſt?

Ier. 16. 14, 15.

All the Commandements, but the fourth and fift haue two accents in each word: they only but one.

N. It may be found in the *fourth Precept*. For as wee are charged *to sanctifie the Sabbath*: so are we especially interdicted all worke vpon that *Day*.

I. Were that granted, which may not bee, (because the affirmatiue speaketh of Sanctification, the negatiue of rest:) yet how will you make these wordes, I am thy Lord thy God, &c. an affirmatiue Commandement? Considering that in them there is no assertiue charge, but only a narratiue claime of Gods right, vnlesse by implication of Consequence you frame an affirmation: by which kinde of Art, you may finde an affirmatiue in each precept.

N. The *seeond thing* wee dislike, in your *rehearsall of the Law*, is the *Prayer* inserted by the

People betweene *euery Commandement: (Lord haue mercie vpon vs, and incline our hearts to keepe this Law.)*

Deut. 27 15. &c

1. Is there not a Prayer put betweene euery Commination in Deuteronomie? Is not (Amen,) or (So be it,) a direct Prayer ioyned with an assent? Is not this Prayer of the People in our Liturgie directed by the patterne, and [d] words of Scriptures?

d *Exod.* 19.8. *Deut.* 5.27 & 29 & 11.18. & 32.29. *Psal.* 81.13.

N. After the *Commandements* comes the *Commination*; wherein we dislike these words *(vntill the said discipline may bee restored againe: which thing is much to be wished.)*

1 I haue heard some of your brethren say that these words are very laudable: because in them is partly promised, and partly wished at least in their opinion) that Discipline of the Church which you pretend to be most ancient: but wee auouch to bee so new that hardly any of you can agree about the fundamentall points thereof.

N. At first we hoped some such *good motion* was in the *mindes* of them that framed the *Liturgie*: But since that time wee haue found *the true meaning of the riddle*, namely, that the *intention* thereof is only *a Popish Lent Penance*.

1. Had you ploughed with our Heyfer; and read the words immediatly going before, this should haue beene no riddle or Ænigma: The wordes are these: In the Primitiue Church; there was a godly Discipline, that at the begin

ning

ning of Lent, ſuch perſons as were notorious ſinners, were put to open penance. But you as cunning in compounding and deuiding, as hee that left out theſe words of the Pſalme e to keepe thee in all thy wayes, haue onely remembred theſe words. In the Primitiue Church there was a godly Diſcipline: and ſo building Caſtles in the aire, benighted your ſelues, in wandring in the wilderneſſe of your owne fancies. But tell mee doe you diſlike our open Penance.

e *Pſal* 91.11. *Math.*4.6.

N. What we diſlike you ſhall know, when we come to the *Viſitation of the Sicke*. Now there remaine *two things*: The *Catechiſme* and the *Homilies*. The *Latter* whereof ſhall be deferred to ſome fitter *opportunitie*. In the *Catechiſme* theſe words are moſt dangerous: *Redeemed mee and all mankinde*; by which the errour of *vniuerſall grace* ſeemes to be defended.

I. Saith not the Scripture that the benefit by Chriſt is come to f all euen to iuſtification: and that he died for g all: and what difference put you betweene all men, and all mankinde.

f *Rom.*5 18.
g 2. *Cor.*5.14,15

N. By *all* there, wee vnderſtand *all the Elect*.

I. So here wee may interpret all the Elect of mankinde. Againe, how are Sinners againſt the Holy Ghoſt ſanctified by the bloud of the h Teſtament? and how are Seducers bought by our Lord?

h *Heb.*10.29. 2. *Pet.*2.1.

N. Some ſay in *Appearance* and *Profeſſion*; others

others say better that *Christ died sufficiently for all men but effectually for beleeuers alone.*

I. Your latter answer cleareth all the doubt: For Christ his Bloud was sufficient for the Redemption of all Mankinde, had they beleeued. Others more subtilly answer, That as the Law intended to condemne all: So Christ purposed to saue all though vpon a different respect) And this they exemplifie by the diuers letters of Ahashueroth: and by the resistance made by the Angell: but this is as Subtle as Safe.

Hest. 8. 14.
Dan. 10, 13.

Chap. XII.

Of the Sacraments in generall: and of Baptisme.

N. OTher exceptions against your *Catechisme* (because they belong to the *Sacraments*) shall bee handled in them. Now therefore, from *Speech onely*, wee come to *Speech* and *Action* mingled: of which are compounded both *Sacraments* and other *Rites*. Touching the *Sacraments in generall*: wee dislike these words in the new addition to your Catechisme (*two generally necessary to Saluation:*) wherein you discouer your *error* concerning both

both the *number* and *end* of the *Sacraments*. The first may bee thus proued: *Where there bee two Sacraments generally necessary, there more then two be necessary in speciall: But the latter is vnsound: Therefore also the former.*

I. **That your** Maior **is dawbed with vntempered mortar may thus appeare:** Where foure elements bee generally necessary for liuing creatures, there more then foure are in speciall necessary. But the latter is vntrue; Therefore likewise the former.

N. Your *Maior* is doubtfull: For this word *generally*, may bee referred to the *predicate*, thus. That the *foure elements* are *in generall* necessary for all things which partake of *Life* (whither it be the life of *Motion*, of *Sence*, or of *Vegetation*) and so the *Speech* is true: But if you referre it to the *Subiect*, and make foure *general elements*, and *more particular* besides: you will runne within the *premunire* of an *errour*.

Which last is not only in trees but euen in Mineralls.

I. **In like manner, must our speech be interpreted: Namely, that there bee two Sacraments, generally necessary for all men. But now confirme your** Minor, **for I beleeue you founder in this opinion.**

N. Sacraments may not come by the *corrupt following of the Apostles:* Neither may they be only *States of life* commended in *Scripture:* But principally they may not want a *visible signe*, or *Ceremony ordained* of God: But the *fiue Popish Sacraments, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimonie,*

trimonie, and *Extreame Vnction*, are *such*; And therefore can be no *Sacraments of the Gospell*. And *by consequent*, there are *onely two*, *Baptisme*, and the *Lords Supper*.

I. First, your Maior is not so sure as you dreame of. For (tell me I pray you) must the signe of each Sacrament be visible? Might not Ahijah the Prophet be partaker of the Passeouer after his sight failed him?

N. I did not meane that *euery receiuer* must *see* the *signe* but that the *signe* must be *visible*, at least *to some*.

I. And not to the receiuer? To him then, it is not a visible signe: and so no actuall Sacrament.

N. Some by *Visible* vnderstand *Sensible*. Namely, that which may bee apprehended by any *outward sence*.

I. This exposition as it is large, and yet true; So will it be preiudiciall to your selfe. To come next to your Minor: First, tell me, Did Matrimony come from the corrupt following of the Apostles?

Marke 6.13.
Iames 5.14.

N. That *first clause* of the *Minor* is only ment of *anoyling*, taken from the *imitation* of the *Apostles*, howsoeuer the *gift of healing* bee now ceased.

I. Yea, but is Anoyling, a state of life commended in Scripture?

N. That part of the *Minor* is to bee applyed to *Orders* and *Matrimony*.

I. Be-

I. Belike then you affirmed that ioyntly of all the Sacraments, which should haue beene deuided among them.

N. We most insist vpon the *last clause:* Namely, that they haue no *visible signe.*

I. Neither is that built vpon a Rocke: For haue not Confirmation and Orders the visible signe of imposition of hands? Can you conceiue of Matrimonie without hand-fasting: Or of Extreame Vnction without Visible Infusion of oyles? Nay, if Sensible bee Visible: and Audible be Sensible: Is not Confession in Penance directly Audible, & so Visible by your owne interpretation?

N. What then? Doe you reuiue the *Seauen Popish Sacraments?*

I. Nothing lesse: But onely I manifest vnto you, with what leaden weapons you impugne the iron enemie, namely, the Papist. Against whom while you deferre to fight, our Church becomes like the Oake cleft with wedges made out of her owne bodie.

N. If this *Argument* be weake you condemne the *Booke of Articles*, which propoundeth the same reason. *Art.25.*

I. You mistake the meaning of the Booke, yea, and the words also. The words are thus: Being such as are growne, partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles: Partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet haue not like nature of Sacraments, with Baptisme and

the Lord's Supper: for that they haue not any visible Signe, or Ceremonie ordained of God. Here first, you perceiue that the word Partly was twice left out of your argument: whereupon came your fallacie of Compounding and Dividing: And so it may bee the hauing of a visible signe (taking Visible in his proper sence) doth exclude Penance (They being onely a state allowed in Scripture doth shut out Matrimony, as the corrupt imitation of the Apostles doth Anoyling. Some such like thing may bee thought of Confirmation and Orders: But it is vncertaine.

N. Yea, but they *all fiue* are denied to haue a *visible signe.*

I. Some coniecture, that by Visible is meant that which is perceiued by many senses: and this kind of Signe may bee proper to Baptisme and the Lords Supper. But the plaine answere is: That no Sacraments excepting those two haue a visible signe generally necessarie to saluation.

N. Without *Orders* there can be no *Ministery*: without the *Ministery* no *Visible Church*: without *which* there can bee no *ordinary saluation.*

I. Orders are mediately necessarie for all: but immediately for Ministers alone.

N. From the *number* of the *Sacraments* I come to *their end*: Namely, their *necessity*: against which I thus argue: *Those things without which*

sal-

ſaluation may be obtained, are not neceſſary to ſaluation. But ſuch are the Sacraments. Ergo.

I. I thus encounter your Maior. Thoſe things without which ſaluation may bee obtained, are not neceſſary to ſaluation. But without Miracles, Saluation may be had, And therefore Micracles (euen thoſe of Chriſt) ſhall bee needleſſe to ſaluation.

N. Miracles are no *ordinary meanes* to *ſaluation*, but *extraordinary*.

I. So Sacraments are not extraordinary, but direct and ordinary meanes: for vnleſſe you be a Swingfeldian; you muſt acknowledge that neglect or contempt of Sacraments is a Barr to life eternall: And ſo both the doubtfulneſſe of your Maior, and falſhood of your Minor, doe at once appeare in their colours.

Which hereſie denieth all outward Sacraments.

N. My *ſecond reaſon* is this: *Things neceſſary to ſaluation doe conferre grace: But Sacraments do not; and ſo are not neceſſary.*

I. Your Maior is not well poiſed. For, is therefore the Sabbath needleſſe to ſaluation, becauſe it doth not conferre grace? Againe your Minor wants the bridle of bondage, and limiting diſtinction. For though Sacraments doe not actiuely, Phyſically, and by infuſion conferre grace, yet none but publique enemies to all Sacraments, will denie that they bring grace paſſiuely, and by the aſſiſtance of the concurrent Spirit of God. Euen as the Circles of Magicians and Spels of Witches, are ſaid to bee

operatiue, not of themselues (being meere quantities) but by the concurrent assistance of Satan with whom the bloudie couenant is stricken. Now that Sacraments are necessary to Saluation, it appeares by three things: First, because they are Gods Ordinances, and so most needfull: Secondly, because they are markes of the Church visible, out of whose bosome there is no ordinary saluation. Thirdly, because faith is begun in Baptisme: and strengthned in the Lords Supper. The necessitie whereof is greater, then of water and fire: nay, then of friendship.

N. This shall bee tried in the *particular Sacrament* to which wee now descend. It seemeth then, that you make *fiue Sacraments: Baptisme, Confirmation, The Lords Supper, Penance*, and *Orders*: which last because it is not expressed in the *Liturgie*, we will now omit.

I. You confesse before, that wee made only two Sacraments generally necessary: why doe you then place Confirmation betweene Baptisme, and the Lords Supper? And where doe you finde out Sacrament of Penance?

N. The reason of these things, shall afterwards be declared. Now I come to *Baptisme*. In the *dignities* you giue to *Baptisme* we note *two errours*. First, you corruptly cite *the words* of *Christ* to *Nicodemus* (*Vnlesse a man be borne of*

z In Confirmation: and the Visitation of the sicke.

water, and of the Holy Ghost.) For by *water* you vnderstand the *Baptisme of the Floud* (as you terme it) Whereas indeed by *water* you should conceiue nothing but the *purging efficacie of the holy Spirit.*

I. Wee embrace the literall sense: why doe you flie to a figure without important necessitie?

N. Yea, *necessitie* doth vrge vs so to doe: For else we should grant the necessitie of *externall Baptisme* to *saluation.*

I. You heard before, that Sacraments were thus necessarie: why doe you now rowle the same stone?

N. Proue in particular now, *Baptisme* to bee necessary to *saluation.*

I. First, Circumcision was thus necessary: For the soule vncircumcised was to be [a] cut off from the people of God. Yea, God would haue slaine Moses because hee neglected the Circumcision of his [b] Sonne. Nay, the necke of the Asse-coult not [c] redeemed, was to bee broken, which redemption was proportionable to Circumcision, as appeares by the [d] time thereof. But Baptisme is answerable to [e] Circumcision: therefore equally necessarie. Secondly, Baptisme is tearmed the lauer [f] of regeneration, whereby the Church is [g] sanctified? It is also called the Baptisme of repentance, vnto remission [h] of sinnes. Yea, Peter and Paul being demanded what men should doe

a *Gen* 17.14.

b *Exod.*4.24.

c *Exod.*13.13.

d *Exod.*22.30.

e 1.*Pet.*3.21.

f *Titus* 3.5.

g *Ephes.*5.26.

h *Marke* 1.4. *Acts* 19.4.

doe to be saued? The one in direct words, both in practise, did vrge [i] Baptisme, as well as beliefe. Yea, Christ himselfe saith: He that beleeueth, and is baptized, shall bee [k] saued. And Peter peremptorily auerreth that Baptisme [l] doth saue.

i *Acts* 2.37,38. & 16.30,33,34

k *Marke* 16,16.

l 1.*Pet.*3,21.

N. First, it seemes by these places: That *salvation* is not ascribed to *Baptisme*, but rather to *Faith* (in the *Acts*) to *Repentance* (in *Marke:*) to the *putting away of the filth of the flesh* (in *Peter.*)

I. Tell mee I pray you by whom are these three things wrought?

N. By the *Spirit* of God.

I. And what relation hath the Spirit to Baptisme?

N. It is the *essentiall inward forme* thereof: whereby *the water is assumed*, as *the manhood* by *Christs God-head.*

I. If that were true, why doe you separate the forme from the matter; which God hath conioyned: But I must here aduertise you, that you sticke in a vulgar errour. For I demand: Is a Sacrament a thing simple, or else compounded.

N. It is compounded of *a thing earthly*, and *a thing heauenly.*

I. What is that heauenly thing?

N. The *Spirit of God* which purgeth our *sinfull soules*, as *water* doth our *vncleane bodies.*

I. Then obserue this argument: Those things

things; of which a thing is compounded; are the matter thereof: but of water and the holy Spirit Baptisme is compounded, these therefore are the matter thereof.

Arist. Phys. lib. 2 cap. 3. Met. lib. 1 cap. 3. & lib. 4. cap. 2.

N. What then doe you make the *forme* of *Baptisme?*

I. The vnion of the Water and the Spirit: as the vnion of Christ his Deitie and Humanitie is the forme of his Person: And as the vnion of the soule and bodie, is the forme of man. And this to bee true, you might haue learned by Athanasius Creed: the matter whereof you could not before disallow; The wordes are these. For as the reasonable Soule, and flesh is one man: So God and man is one Christ. By this you may obserue, That the Spirit is not disioyned from the water in Baptisme: considering, they both concurre to make the matter thereof.

Obserue by this, that most heresies in diuinitie do proceed from errours in Logique and Philosophie.

N. But wee cannot be assured: that the *Spirit* doth alwayes concurre with the *water*, howsoeuer you do confidently auouch that *Children*, being *baptized*, haue all things necessary for their *Saluation*, and be *vndoubtedly saued*. Touchinh the former clause thereof, I intreate you now to be silent, because I will obiect it in *Confirmation*.

In the rubrick of Confirmation before the beginning of the Catechisme.

I. The latter clause then needes little defence: For seeing Baptisme is the ordinarie meanes of saluation: why should wee causelesly doubt of their Saluation, which haue beene

beene made partakers thereof? For not only Charitie, but euen Equitie forbids vs to doubt.

N. Yea, but some scruple remaineth because we want the *certaintie* of *infallibilitie.*

I. That certaintie is needlesse in our ordinary censures of other mens eternall state: For where prudence vpon necessitie doth not weigh downe the ballance, Charitie must heaue it vp: and (according to the Law) fauours must be inlarged. And now let me admonish you of the like cauill, made against the words in our Liturgie in the Buriall; which are these: In sure and certaine hope of resurrection to eternall life: By which wee doe not imply a certaintie of infallibilitie, but of equitie alone. For although persons bee baptized, yet, if they bee excommunicated, or other wayes hainous Malefactors, wee denie them the vse of Christian Buriall: Forasmuch as by the rule of prudence wee presume not to speake of them in that manner.

N. Of your *Popish Superstitions* in *Buriall*, wee shall treate in due place. Now against your *Scriptures* brought for the *necessitie of Baptisme*: although I might except against these words in *Genesis* (*shall be cut off from his people*:) as being meant of *Temporall Death*, not of *Eternall Damnation*: yet because I finde some of *our owne men*, so to expound it also, I will omit it; and come to my second *exception*, which is this. You pretend that *Baptisme* is before *Faith*: whereas both

both in *Marke* and the *Acts* it is set in the *latter place*. Yea, and *Philip* requireth *faith* of the *Eunuch*; before hee would admit him to *Baptisme*. Acts 8.37.

I. **We denie not but in men of yeares** faith **may come before** Baptisme.

N. By *Faith* alone wee are saued, what need then of *Baptisme?*

I. **If you speake of** absolute necessitie, **God could haue saued vs, not only without** Baptisme, **but euen without** faith: **yea euen without** Christ. **For if hee had giuen vs** immutable grace **before** our fall, Christ's death **should not haue beene necessarie; and so** faith **had beene void, and consequently** Baptisme. **But, if you intend a** conditionall necessitie **in regard of** God's Decree: **it will appeare that** Christ's death **was an** efficient cause **howbeit not the** principall (**for that was** God's loue) **but a** working meritorious cause. **As also that** faith **is an** instrument actiue, **and** Baptisme passiue: **applying to vs the** merits **of** Christ's **death. Againe, whereas you say,** that wee are saued by faith alone: **Doe you imagine that** faith **may bee void of** good workes? Iohn 3.16.

N. I detest *that Poperie:* But what is this to *Baptisme?*

I. **Is it not a** good worke **and fruit of** faith, **to seeke for** externall Baptisme?

N. Yet by this it is manifest, that *Baptisme* succeedeth *faith*, which contradicteth your *assertion*.

I. Though Baptiſme do only confirme faith in men of yeares, is it therefore needleſſe to Saluation? But yet Infants faith is apparantly concurrent with Baptiſme, by which it is begotten. For as Infants may be elected by Predeſtination; and alſo may be comprehended in the Couenant, and faith of Parents: So withall, there muſt be required in them the Spirit of God, which ſhall worke analogicall faith, or the Seed-plot thereof: from which at the time of effectuall Vocation, or Conuerſion, ſhall iſſue the ſeaſonable fruits of Sanctification.

N. My *third exception* againſt your *Scriptures* is this: Whereas it is ſaid, *He that ſhall beleeue and be baptized, ſhall be ſaued:* it is immediately added, *He that ſhall not beleeue ſhall be condemned:* So that *Baptiſme* is omitted as no *neceſſarie meanes of ſaluation.*

I. Your proofes are taken from ſilent witneſſes (which cannot bee of force.) In this manner: Baptiſme is not mentioned as needfull, and therefore is not needfull.

N. Yet according to the *rules of diſcretion*, *Baptiſme* ſhould be named aſwell in the *negatiue*, as in the *poſitiue.*

I. By the ſame rule, what is largely ſet downe in the former, is vnderſtood in the latter: becauſe it is preſuppoſed that no heartie beleeuer will neglect Baptiſme.

N. Beſides theſe exceptions againſt *the texts* by you alledged, wee haue other reaſons to diſ-

proue

proue the *neceßitie of Baptiſme.* As firſt many *Perſons Circumciſed* and *Baptized*, haue yet failed of *eternall life:* And therefore it ſeemeth, that theſe are not neceſſary meanes of *ſaluation.*

I. Many that haue had ſufficient cold and drought in their bodies, haue yet died of grieuous diſeaſes: and therefore theſe qualities are not meanes of life.

N. Heate and *moyſture* muſt alſo concurre: or elſe theſe are inſufficient.

I. So the Spirit muſt concurre with Water, or elſe it is not auailable: For though the Spirit be not tied to Meanes: yet may we not vilifie the meanes as vneffectuall: or moue cauſeleſſe doubts touching the aſſiſtant cooperation of the Spirit.

N. I ſecondly thus argue: *Paul came not to baptiſe: Therefore Baptiſme is not neceſſarie to ſaluation.* The *Conſequence* is apparant: For *Paul* without controuerſie, came to procure all things neceſſary thereunto. I.*Cor.*1.17.

I. Your Conſequence is ambiguous: For an ordinary Paſtor's office, is neceſſary to the ſaluation of many: And yet Saint Paul, being an Occumenicall Apoſtle, who had the care of all Churches, could not attend that function. Againe, your antecedent is impertinent: The meaning is open, That hee was ſent rather to preach, then to baptize. For, that hee baptized ſome, appeares out of that place. The like Phraſe is in theſe words: I will haue *Math.*11.7.

mercy and not Sacrifice? That is, rather mercie then sacrifice. What? will you make Sacrifice not necessarie in the time of the Law? By all this it appeareth: That for feare of the necessitie of Baptisme, you relinquish the letter of the text without necessitie.

Luke 3.16.

N. Though this were yeilded: yet for *two other reasons*, we may not here expound *water* literally. First, because where the *Holy Ghost* and *fire* are conioyned: *fire* may not be taken according to the *letter*: vnlesse wee will follow the vaine custome of the *Æthiopians*, which set *fierie prints* vpon their *Infants* through the mistaking of this *text*.

Acts 1. 5. & 2. 3, 4.

I. We need not goe so farre as Æthiopia for our interpretation. Compare the Storie of the Acts, and there will be no ambiguitie: for as Iohn fore-told, and Christ promised: So the Apostles indeed were baptized with the Holy Ghost by the Ministerie of fiery tongues: which if the Æthiopians could procure, wee would not blame their fierie Ceremonie.

Iohn 3.8.

N. Our *second reason* is this: The scope of *Christs speech*, is to intreat of *regeneration*: which is the worke of the *Spirit* alone: And therefore, it is not probable that there hee should speake of *outward Baptisme*.

Iohn 3.12.

I. Your seqnell is evidently refuted by the words of Christ: If when I tell you earthly things you beleeve not, &c. where by things earthly wee vnderstand things elementary:

which

which appellation may well agree to water, in Baptiſme. In ſumme, remember this: That whereas many, through a ſeeming ſubtletie doe embrace tropicall expoſitions: they bewray themſelues to be of ſtomacks diſtempered, not induring ſolid ordinarie meates.

N. The *ſecond thing* whereby you magnifie *Baptiſme*, appeare in theſe wordes: *By the Baptiſme of thy welbeloued Sonne Ieſus Chriſt, didſt ſanctifie the flood* Iordan, *and all other waters, to the myſticall waſhing away of ſinne:* where finde you any warrant for this new deuice?

I. I wonder where the knot lieth, for I conceiue it not as yet: Is it in this? That we ſay, that all waters are ſanctified to the myſticall waſhing away of ſin in Baptiſme? Thinke you that Abana and Pharphar are better then other Riuers? Can you prohibit any kinde of water to be vſed in Baptiſme? 2. *Kings* 5. 12.

N. That is farre from our meaning. But wee diſlike that you aſcribe the *Sanctification of water to the Baptiſme* of *Chriſt*, as to the *cauſe*.

I. Why was Chriſt baptiſed? *Math.* 3. 15.

N. That *all righteouſneſſe* might be fulfilled.

I. What? doe you meane the righteouſneſſe of the Law?

N. I meane of the *Goſpell*.

I. Did he fulfill it for himſelfe or more principally for vs?

N. I am no *Papiſt*, to dreame that he merited any thing for himſelfe.

I. Nay, was hee borne: did hee liue or die for himselfe?

N. All for *Vs* without doubt.

I. He was then baptized for vs.

N. I may not denie it.

I. Wherefore as his Birth, Life, and Death did sanctifie the same things in vs; So by the water of his Baptisme; all waters are sanctified: euen as all beasts drinke safely when the Vnicorne hath put his horne into the water. So that hee may bee called the first-fruites of the Baptized, aswell as of the Dead.

N. Hitherto of the *Dignitie* and holinesse of *Baptisme*. Now follow the *actions* of *witnesses*, (or *Godfathers* as you call them:) which are *foure*. First, you admit *questions* to bee propounded to them: Secondly, they promise sundry things for the Children: Thirdly, the Children by their meanes, are said to haue *Faith* and *Repentance*: Fourthly, They impose *names* vpon the Infants. Of which the *three first*, are absurd, vnreasonable, and almost ridiculous: and therefore prophane, or blasphemous: The *fourth* is vniust, considering it is *the parents due* to giue *names* to their Children.

I. I should maruell much (but that amongst Nouelists, nothing is to bee wondred at) that you can tolerate Godfathers: But now I remember my selfe, they bee suffered in Geneua. Now tell me (pray you) by what Scripture do you allow them.

N.

N. Some pretend *an ancient custome* begun by a *Roman Bishop* (in the dayes of *Antoninus Pius*) who first ordained that *certaine choice witnesses* should present the *Children* to the *Congregation*, in case their *Parents* were *dead*, or *fled* for *persecution*: Others alledge *the witnesses* recorded in *Isaiah* the *Prophet*. *Isa.8.2.*

I. But now you know are the times of peace: and so the former cause is void: As for the latter, it was drawne from a Propheticall and singular practise, and therefore hardly may be urged as imitable. Could we produce no firmer Scriptures for our Ecclesiasticall practice, then such as those, would you not cry out vpon vs as Hercules Furens, or as Orestes.

N. What better proofes then haue you for your *Godfathers?*

I. Children are truly said to be baptized into the faith of others: which speech is by many mistaken. For they suppose they are baptised into the faith of their immediate Parents only: which being granted; the Children not only of Pagans, and Turkes, which are taken in Warre, but euen of persons excommunicated, yea of all that are destitute of true faith shall be interdicted the vse of Baptisme: whereas the truth is: that Infants are receiued into the faith and bosome of the Church, which is the Keepresse of the Couenant. The Church therefore chuseth certaine witnesses as representatiue persons: to whom the questions are tendered:

and

and by whom the promises are vttered in the behalfe of the Babes. No maruell then, though by their meanes, Infants be said to haue faith, and Repentance; and to receiue their Christian names from them, as being their Fathers in God: and therefore not vnaptly tearmed Godfathers. The generall proofe of which thing is drawne from all Lawes, which allow sundry actions done by Guardians in the minoritie of their Wards, to be as firme as if the Pupils themselues had performed them in their owne persons being come to the yeares of discretion.

N. To admit this reason: yet to preiudice the Parents, who should haue *the right of naming their Children*, cannot but bee very iniurious.

1. You are woorse afraid then hurt: For they are very contentious Godfathers which aske not the Parents consent in this matter. But where be your Scriptures to proue that this is only the priuiledge of Fathers.

Gen.5.3.& 35. 18. *Luke 1.63.*

N. We haue the example of *Adam*, *Iacob*, and *Zacharie*.

Gen.29.32. *1.Sam.4 21.*

I. Wee could oppose to these the examples of Leah: and the wife of Phinees.

N. *Leah* did it only by the consent of her husband *Iacob*: as may bee collected by his practice in changing *Benoni* to *Beniamin*: As for *Phinnees wife* she was a Widow.

Gen.4 25.

I. Your examples also are not void of all scruple: For it is said, That Sheth receiued his

his name from Euah: which (as it may seeme) requested Adam that this name might bee imposed. As for Iacob; it seemes that his wiues did ouer intreate him for the names of his Children, except only the last. Now for Zacharie, your instance is impertinent: For it is probable by the Story that the friends and kinsfolke did of Custome name the Child. And that Zachary did countermand them only by vertue of the Angels Charge: But you contend for trifles. *Luke* 1.59. *Luke* 1.13.

N. From *Publique Baptisme*, we come to *Priuate*. The *necessitie* whereof wee dislike, as imitating the *Popish Limbus Infantum*.

I. I had thought that the necessitie of Sacraments in generall, and of Baptisme in particular, had beene confirmed sufficiently, why doe you now seethe the same Colewoorts?

N. It seemes you pretend *necessitie of Baptisme to saluation:* and therefore would haue it administred at home in such cases.

I. These things are ill vnderstood, and worse conioyned: For the necessitie we intend, is not that of Saluation, but in regard of infirmities or other inconueniences: As for example, If a Childe amongst the Hebrewes, had beene sicke on the eighth day, Circumcision, vpon necessitie should haue beene deferred: would you haue called this the necessitie of saluation? Againe, if wee say that Children vnbaptized, and so dying, are (in respect of ordi-

nary meanes) forlorne; and out of the course of Saluation, may not the Speech, being well tempered, be truly iustified?

N. You had need of *good skill* to temper the mettall of this speech.

I. These Cautions will serue to allay it, namely, That if there be neither Baptisme, nor desire of the same: and that neither in the Infant nor in his Parents, nor in the visible Church (wherein he is borne, or into which hee is casually brought;) Then, without extraordinarie grace, hee is excluded from the meanes of saluation. And what is all this to the Limbe of Infants? For although the Childe bee damned, nay, though hee suffer a lesse degree of torment, (for degrees of Hell paines I hope you will not denie) yet this will not make the Popish Limbus: which is (as the Papists determine it) the punishment of losse, and not of sense: Or of sense outward, but not inward: the fire, but not the worme. In summe, the Papists make a new kinde of punishment: wee only another degree.

Mat. 5. 22. & 10. 15. *Luke* 10 48. 1. *Cor.* 19. 41.

N. Be this as you say: yet you cannot proue *Baptisme* to be so *necessary*, that it should produce both *Lathro-baptisme*: and *Anti-baptisme* (which *latter* is a *kinde of Anabaptisme*:) In your *Lathro-baptisme* (or *priuate Baptisme*) first we disallow that it is administred priuately in houses.

Exod. 4. 25. & 11. 28.

I. Were not Circumcision and the Passeouer both

both celebrated within the walls of the house? Did not Philip baptize the Eunuch in the next water he met with not expecting any Ecclesiasticall Assembly to assist him? Hath not the Church beene confined to a [a] Chamber? and to a priuate [b] house? Was not the Iayler with all his Family baptized by Saint Paul within [c] dores? Are not Priuate Chaplaines allowed in the Houses of great Personages? But of all men, you should be silent herein, whose Classes and Conuenticles, haue beene like to the House of Lecca to Catiline.

Acts 8.36.

a *Acts* 1.13.
b *Rom* 16.5. 1.*Cor.*16.19.

c *Acts* 16.33.

N. The *second thing* we dislike is: That you allow *priuate Persons* (euen *women*) to administer *Baptisme*, vpon this pretended *extremitie*.

I. First, our Lawes disclaime it, as a thing not expedient: Secondly, notwithstanding we hold it lawfull: But here mistake not our meaning: For although both before, and in the doing, we allow it not, yet, being once done, we account the action for no nullitie.

N. Wee know that you defend *Zipporah* for circumcising her childe: but wee are of another minde.

I If a man should demand of you a place of Scripture, where Priests and not Priuate men; Nay, where men and not women are commanded to circumcize Infants, I beleeue you would sooner finde the head of Nilus, then such a place. Might not euery one offer the Passeouer in his owne house? Nay, in case

the mistresse of the house were a widow, and had none of her Family but of the female sexe. Can you proue that shee was bound to send for a Priest or a Man to slay the Paschall Lambe for her?

N. Yea, but *Christ* commanded his *Apostles* to baptize: and therefore this cannot be tolerable in *priuate men.*

Math. 28.19.

I. It is said, That Christ baptized more then Iohn: yet in his owne person he baptized none, but only vsed the ministery of his Disciples. So it may be the Apostles baptized not by themselues but by [d] others, which thing is also to bee vnderstood of their administring the Lords Supper: as is collected by the speech of the Twelue to the multitude: For although it seeme principally to be spoken of almes: yet because almes were commonly ioyned with the Communion, it may be both were implied.

John 4.1,2.

d *Acts* 10.48. 1. *Cor.* 1.17. *Acts* 6.3.

N. But it is against *reason*, that any saue *Ecclesiastic all persons* should be trusted with *Baptisme.*

I. The same is agnized by our Lawes; not because the thing is absolutely vnlawfull (much lesse for that being performed it is a mere nullitie) but only because it is not conuenient, as hath beene said.

N. From *Lathro-baptisme*, we come to *Antibaptisme*: which is a *Conditionall Baptisme*: A strange kinde of Law: Not vnlike some of the *Edicts* of *Claudius Cæsar*: For in case it be doubted, whether the *Infant* bee truly baptized *at home*,

home, the *Priest* is commanded, thus to *rebaptize* him: *If thou be not baptized already, I baptize thee, &c.*

I. An abundant caution, hurts not (saith the Law.) For (tell me I pray you:) If you should find a young Infant in the streets of some City: and through the bowels of compassion did intend the education thereof, would you baptize it, or no?

N. It were the safer course *to baptize it.*

I. It may bee then you rebaptize it: For peraduenture it was baptized before it was exposed.

N. The ignorance of the fact, whereof *my selfe* am not the *author* doth excuse me, because it is presumed to be invincible.

I. In like manner, when, by no inquirie, it can bee certainly knowne what was done in Priuate Baptisme, this Cautelous Prouiso may take place. And yet some[e] thinke that this was neuer yet put in practice. Some rumours haue beene to the contrarie: but the thing is ambiguous.

[e] Master *Thomas Hutten.*

CHAP.

Chap. XIII.

Of the Crosse in Baptisme.

N. Hitherto haue we treated of the parts of *Baptisme*: Now followeth the *consequent* or *thing annexed* thereto: Namely the *Crosse*: which sinneth against the *Ten Commandements*: and first, against the *first precept*, by *Idolatrie*.

I. Is the Crosse an inward Idoll of the heart: or else an Idoll externall?

N. It is an *Idoll*: an *Idolathite*: a *monument* of, and a *motiue* to *Idolatrie*. Now although it doe only tempt to the conceiuing of *an inward Idoll*: (which temptation is forbidden in the *Tenth Commandement* alone) yet properly it is but an *Outward Idoll*, violating the *First Commandement* and so to be abolisht.

I. Your speech is as fruitfull of errours, as Nilus of slime. At this time it hath hatched sixe Monsters: whereof the three first are slips in Method, where from, commonly false opinions doe proceed. The first is, That you make tempting and motiue to bee two seuerall things: whereas in this case they both agree. The second is: that you place tempting to Idolatrie

dolatrie in the *Tenth Commandement*, whereas to be a motiue to the same sinne, is by you made a transgression of the first Precept.

N. Tempting may be without *Consent*: whereas a *motiue*, implyith *consent*, or *assent*: and so the *former* is in the *tenth*, the *latter* in the *first Commandement*.

I. Your words are confused: But I haste to your matter. Tell me (I pray you) the order of sinnes against the Commandements.

N. All sinnes are either against *God* (forbidden in the *first Table*) or against *our neighbour* (interdicted in the *second*:) Againe, the *sinnes* against our neighbour are either *with consent* (prohibited in the *fift* and the *foure following Precepts.*) Or *without the same* (restrained onely in the *tenth Commandement.*)

I. Where then are sinnes against God without consent prohibited (namely, the first motions and abstractions from Him?) Are they not in the first? So that you erred, when you made temptation to Idolatrie, a sinne against the tenth. Your third default is, that you make an outward Idoll to bee forbidden in the first.

N. How may this appeare to be an *errour*?

I. You erre from the opinion, both of the Learned, and of the Vulgar: First, the Learned thinke, that in the first Precept, the only having, and the acknowledging of the True God, is enioyned: and his true (both inward and outward) worship in the Second. Secondly,

ly, the most vulgar wits are of opinion that God's inward worship is commanded in the first, and his outward in the second Precept. By both which sentences, you are cast in your suite: Forasmuch as all externall Idols, are to bee referred to the next ensuing Commandement. Hence you may learne, First, That your three next errours (namely, that euerie Idoll is to be abolished: that the Crosse is an Idoll: That it tempteth to Idolatrie.) Secondly, that your three next arguments (namely, that it is an Idolothite: a Monument of, and a motiue to Idolatrie) are to be handled in the Second Precept.

N. I proceed then to the *second Commandement.*

I. I pray you let me intreate you, before you proceed, that you would repeate in order the sinnes against the nine next Commandements committed by the Crosse.

N. The second *Precept* is violated by the *Superstition:* The third, by the *Hypocrisie:* (for it brings *vaine feare* and *trust:*) The *fourth*, by the *impietie* (for it thrusts out *Ministers* that would celebrate the *Sabbath.*) The *fift* by the *Iniustice:* The *sixt* by the *murther*, (for it is scandalous.) The *seuenth*, by *Adulterie*, (as being the *punishment* of *Idolatrie:*) The *eighth* by the *wrong:* The *ninth*, by the *slander.* The *tenth*, by the *Concupiscence* of the *Crosse* (for it tempteth vs to adore *Popish Idolls:*)

I. Your

I. Your ten imputations may be drawne to three: For first Hypocrisie, and prophane impietie, cannot agree with Superstition: Secondly, if you proue not the Idolatrie, your allegations will bee cold concerning adulterie and temptation: Thirdly, if the Crosse bee neither Idolatrous, Superstitious nor Scandalous: you will hardly manifest the iniustice, wrong, or slander of the Crosse. It resteth then, That you proue the Idolatrie, Superstition, and Scandall of the same: The rest of your Snow-balls will melt of themselues.

N. First, then I proue the *Idolatrie of the Crosse*, by those foure *Arguments* which I before remembred.

I. But before you repeate them: Consider these Consequences. First, the Church of the Lutherans maintaine images, which we terme idols, as iustly as you doe the Crosse: Shall we then say, that they be idolaters: Secondly, if the Crosse bee an idoll: Then, either haue the Brownists done well in seperatiug themselues from idols: Or we (with the Reformed Churches) haue done ill, in pretending no greater cause of Separation from Rome, then her idolatrie.

N. An *Idoll* may be taken either *essentially* (such were the *Calues* of *Ieroboam* from which the *Lewites* did separate [a] themselues) Or else by *participation* and occasion only (such was the *Altar* of *King* [b] *Ahaz*, from which no *Seperation*

a 2. *Chron.* 11. 14.
b 2. *Kings* 16. 11, 14.

was made.) Of the *first kinde* are the *Idols of Rome*, which make their *Church Idolatrous*, and iustifie our *Separation* from them: Of the *latter sort*, are the *Images* of *Lutherans*, and *our Crosse*: And therefore the *Barrowists* haue erred in their seperation from vs.

I. Our Crosse then is only an Idoll by occasion; That is, a motiue to idolatrie; and so your fourth and first Argumens are confounded. Againe, what reasoning is this: There is idolatrie in the Crosse, only by occasion and possibilitie; and yet you declaime at large against the actuall Idolatrie thereof: But of this hereafter: Now repeate the first Argument.

N. Euery *Idoll* is to be abolished, as appeares both by [c] *Lawes*, and by [d] *examples*. But the *Crosse* is an *Idoll*: and therefore to be abolished.

I. If your Maior were true, Then the Sun and Moone so much worshipped by the Heathens. Paul and Barnabas deified by the men of [e] Listra: yea, and the bread in the Sacrament (as being adored by Papists) should bee destroied, and abrogated.

N. My *Maior* admitteth *two exceptions*: First, of *Gods creatures*, (such are the *Sunne*, and *Moone*: such were *Paul* and *Barnabas*.) Secondly, of *Gods Ordinances* (such is the *bread in the Sacrament* (for these may not bee destroyed though they be *idolized*.

I. Your exceptions are neither true, nor sufficient:

c *Deut.* 7.5 & 12.3. *Iosh.* 23.7.
d *Gen.* 35.4. *Exod.* 32.10. 2 *Sam.* 5.22. 1. *Kings* 15 13. 2. *Kings* 10.26. & 11.18. & 18.4. & 23.12.
e *Acts* 14.12.

ficient: For first, God destroied the Gods of Egypt: [f] and yet these being (Aspes, Crocodiles, Dogges, and the like) were his creatures: Likewise he commanded the Groues (things not to bee exempted from the number of his Creatures) to be burnt. Iosias also put downe the horses of the [g] Sunne) and yet they were things created by God: Secondly, the brazen Serpent (being Gods Ordinance) was (notwithstanding) broken in pieces by Ezekias: Thirdly, Churches of Christians are neither Gods creatures, nay his direct ordinances: yet may not be demolished, howsoeuer they haue beene polluted with Idols.

[f] *Numb.* 33. 4.

[g] 2. *Kings* 23. 11

N. First, *your instances* may bee disproued: For it is not certaine that *God* destroyed *the Gods of Egypt*. It may be also that by *Gods*, are meant *the Images* only. The *Groues* were to bee burnt, not as *created by God*, but as *ordered by mans art*. The *Horses of the Sunne* were remoued by *the King*, but not destroyed: Secondly, *Churches* were ordained by God, as appeares by *Salomons Temple*. Thirdly, if God, neither spare his owne *Creatures*, nor *ordinances*, how shall we spare *the inuentions of men*.

I. First, your answeres to my instances, leane vpon vncertaine suppos'als, and wrested distinctions: Secondly, what you say of Churches is vntrue: For both the house of [h] Dagon was more ancient then Salomon's Temple: and (by your owne [i] confession) this Temple was a

[h] 1. *Sam.* 5. 20.

[i] In the third Chapter of this Booke. R.

part of the Ceremoniall Law: and so hath no agreement with the Churches of Christians: Thirdly, you confesse your owne exceptions to be false: For asmuch as God neither spareth his owne creatures nor his ordinances, being defiled with Idolatrie: Fourthly, you seeme to answer nothing to the Brazen Serpent.

N. I will reserue that to *another place*: Now what answere you to the *Lawes* and *Examples* by me alledged?

I. They proue only that the same individuall idolized things are to be destroied, but not their whole kind. For example: we may not burne all trees, because one tree hath beene transformed into an Idoll. And now I pray you confirme your Minor: Namely, that the Crosse is an Idoll.

N. Every humane ordinance, adored by Papists, is an Idoll: But such is our Crosse: and therefore to be reckoned amongst Idols.

I. Your Maior must be thus limited: Every humane ordinance, which was idolatrous in the first institution, is an Idoll: Else Churches shall be Idols: and the Brownist lust, that wisheth their ruine: Againe, your Minor is untrue: For our particular aeriall Crosses were neuer worshipped by Papists. Now we may not for the abuse of some individualls, abolish the whole kinde. Neither indeed is our Crosse of the same kinde with the Popish, differing therefrom in operations: For their Crosse is

said to driue away Deuils: to Consecrate things vnto God, and the like: which things wee ascribe not to our Crosse. Now the diuersitie of operations, doth sufficiently distinguish the kindes of things artificiall: of which number is the Crosse.

N. I will in another sort inforce *this Argument. The brazen Serpent ought to haue beene destroyed because it was worshipped: But our Crosse is as the brazen* [l] *Serpent: And therefore (being worshipped) is to be destroyed.*

l *Iohn* 3.14. & 8.28. & 12.32, 33.

I. If the premises were true, they would onely inforce the destruction of the Popish Crosse, which hath no affinitie with ours. But indeed, first, your Maior is vntrue.

N. Ezekias is prayed for [m] it: Therefore hee ought to haue done it.

m 2. *Kings* 18.5

I. Your Consequence is weake: First, because it may bee it was a thing indifferent, namely, whether he would destroy or remoue the Serpent. For tell mee, A Prince is praised for building a Church or Hospitall: shall wee say hee was bound to doe it? was it not left arbitrarie to him, whether he would by this, or some other meanes declare his Princely magnificence to the Church, or to the poore? Secondly, it is probable, that the King did this by a diuine instinct.

N. When I vsed the like [n] answere, you disallowed, it as vnsound.

n In this first booke, *Chap.* 3.

I. But I haue a firme reason for my Assertion.

tion. A diuine ordinance could not bee disanulled, but by a diuine ordinance and instinct. But such was the brazen Serpent: And therefore without some such instinct could not be lawfully defaced. But this instinct being speciall cannot bee exemplarie. Besides, your Minor is not well confirmed out of Saint Iohn: First, because a figure cannot be the signe of a figure, but of a thing figured: except you meane that it was a paralel figure, as Baptisme o to the Floud: But so you honour the Crosse more then we: Secondly, these places especially the first (for the two latter make no mention of the Serpent) doe resemble Christ to the Serpent, and the Crosse only to the Pole, or Instrument on which the Serpent was eleuated: So that if you had spoken pertinently, you should haue thus reasoned: The brazen Serpent, being worshipped, was to be defaced: But Christ was as the brazen Serpent: And therefore being worshipped, is to bee defaced: This conclusion would serue well vnder the standard of Christ's Enemies.

o 1. Pet. 3. 21.

N. My *second argument* to proue the *Idolatry* of the *Crosse* is this. *The Crosse is an Idolothite (or thing offered to Idols: and therefore is with them to be abolished.*

1. Your reason is firme against the Popish Crosse: and so drawes in the same yoke of impertinence with the former: Againe, it is a phrase of hard concoction to say that an Idoll

was

was offered to Idols: Lastly, meates consecrated to Idols might not be refused, but in case of p scandall: and therefore you may reserue this bul-rush till you come to that place.

p 1. Cor. 10 25.

N. Thirdly, I thus proue the *Idolatry of the Crosse:* It is a *Relique* and *Monument of Idolatrie: and therefore Idolatrous.*

I. If this word Monument be deduced from q remayning, then how can our transient aeriall Crosse be a Monument. But if it be taken from warning, then is it onely a Monument, as it is a motiue to Idolatrie. And so your third and fourth Arguments iustle together, as the Rockes called Symplegades in the Euxine Sea. And this your fourth reason you may let passe till you speake of Scandall: For if it be not Scandalous it is no motiue to Idolatrie.

q *Monimentum à μόνιμος (permanens) vel à monendo monumentum: vt documentum, ce nocumentum, à docendo nocendoq; ducta.*

N. From the *Idolatrie* of the *Crosse*, I flie to the *Superstition* thereof: which I proue also by *foure Arguments:* First, the *Crosse* was inuented by *Valentinus* the *Heretique*; and confirmed by a *Fabulous Vision* fathered vpon *Constantine:* namely, that he saw, *the figure of the Crosse* in the aire: and heard these words: *Ouercome in* r *this* whereupon hee is said to haue made the *signe of the Crosse* in his *Standard:* Whereas it is more likely that he saw the *Letters of Christ's name:* and therefore it cannot be but *superstitious.*

r τούτῳ νικᾷ. Or by this, or to this (namely to Christ) of whom this Crosse is a remembrance.

I. That Valentinus vsedit, wee denie not: But you cannot proue that he was the Inuentor thereof. This is some thing like your Storie

rie you told of Iubal the inuentor of Musique. Againe, the Primitiue Church was not so nice as you: to refuse all inuentions of Heretiques. What? will you reiect Printing and Gunnes, because they were found out by Papists? will the Papists neglect verses in their Bibles, because a Protestant was the [f] Authour of them? As for that which you relate of Constantine, thinke you we will not rather beleeue his eies, and the consent not only of his Armie, but euen of the whole Church, then your contradictory, and lately-borne vnlikelihoods?

[f] Robert Steuen.

N. My *second reason* to proue *the superstition of the Crosse* is this. *The first vse of making the Crosse is abolished:* (Namely, the *Profession of Christ's Crosse before the Pagans which derided the same.) It is therefore superstitious.*

I. The weaknesse of this reason was declared, when we spake of Gloria Patri: for though the first vse were growne old, another equally profitable may succeed: Againe, there be too many despisers of the Crosse, especially the men of your heate: in regard of whom the first vse may remaine in his full vigour.

N. The Crosse at first was vsed in presence of the *Pagans*, not in *Baptisme*, whether the *Paynims* were not admitted.

I. The vse thereof was ancient in Baptisme: euen during the time of Paganisme: But our contemners of the Crosse, are admitted to behold (I had almost said to celebrate) our Sacraments.

N.

N. Thirdly, I thus reason. *The Crosse is added to Baptisme, and that as a Sacramentall or Signifying Signe: And is therefore superstitious.*

I. Your Antecedent leanes vpon an errour, and a slander. Your errour is, that you suppose Sacraments to bee bare signes, and not to conuey grace by assistance: The Crosse is a signe: yet not Sacramentall, but humane and voluntary: not of our couenant with God; but of our profession towards men: As if a man should put a Map of Canaan in the end of the Booke of Iosua: not as a diuine addition thereto; but as an humane explication thereof. In like manner the Crosse doth historically, not sacramentally describe vnto vs Christ's death: wherefore it is a slander that we adde it to Baptisme as Sacramentall or Essentiall.

N. Wee may not set *another Altar* by *that* which [t] is *God's*: nor a *threshold* by his [u] *threshold*: and therefore wee may not adde the *Crosse* to Baptisme.

t 2. *Kings* 16.14
u *Ezek.* 43.8.

I. These places only proue, that Idolatrie may not bee mingled with Gods worship: Now the Idolatrie of the Crosse you were not able to proue.

N. Fourthly, I thus argue against the *Crosse*. *It was remoued out of the Lords Supper. And therefore in like manner is to be taken out of Baptisme.*

I. First, being a thing indifferent (as wee maintaine it) it was lawfull to abolish it in

the one, and to retaine it in the other Sacrament. Secondly, the retaining of the Crosse in the Lord's Supper, was more dangerous, by reason of the Artolatrie, (or worship of the bread) as also because there it was more permanent, and durable, then in Baptisme.

N. Because you make the *Crosse a thing indifferent*, I passe to the *third thing*, which is a *Scandall*: as being most conuersant about things of that kinde. And thus I argue: *A thing, though indifferent, yet being Scandalous is to bee remoued. But such is the Crosse: to be remoued therefore.*

I. If all were granted, yet are you bound to Subscription: For in things indifferent, howsoeuer offensiue, the Scandal doth redound vpon the Commander, not vpon him that obeyeth. For example: If a Master charge his Seruant to roast that piece of meat, which is more fit to be boyled: shall the Seruant plead indifferencie out of his disobedience? Can any Family or Common-wealth long indure with such rude discipline? But to let your Argument stand in force: First, your Maior must be limited to Scandall giuen, and not taken: and then is your Minor vntrue: For the Scandall of the Crosse is not iustly giuen, but vniustly taken. This appeares by two reasons. First, as it is commanded, for to vse it, is a thing indifferent: but to reiect it is the sinne of Disobedience to lawfull Authoritie: Secondly, though it were not enioyned: yet is it not offensiue for two

causes: First, because they which are offended hereby, are neither in number, nor dignitie, comparable to them which are not scandalized: Secondly, because a thing scandalous, is an act (that is a deed, speech, or gesture) causing the weake to erre out of the way, or to stumble in it: For as much as they are not weake, which pretend themselues hereby to be offended, it cannot iustly bee tearmed scandalous.

N. They bee *weake* that are offended by the *Crosse*, some *within*, and some *without our Church*: within are both *Ministers* and *People*.

I. The Ministers may not iustly be accounted weake: For if they confesse it, why do they resist that wherein they acknowledge their owne weaknesse? If they denie it, how comes it to passe, that they write so largely, and (as they thinke) learnedly against it? Againe, If they denie it, they cannot bee scandalized: for none can be offended but weake Brethren.

N. No men in a *controuersie* will acknowledge *their owne weaknesse*: So that, by *this reason* none can be *offended*.

I. Ministers are presumed to bee strong in common construction: especially when they dare by writing oppose themselues to the Church: which is not vnlike the heaping of Mountaines against Heauen.

N. Yea, but the *People* are offended *two wayes*: First, the *Sheepe* are scattered when the *Shepheard*

is smitten: especially when *his necessarie office* is taken from him for *things indifferent*, such as you pretend the *Crosse* to be.

I. Disobedience in things indifferent, is sinfull, and not indifferent: And better it were the People to bee vtterly vntaught, then to bee carried about with so many windie fancies as haue beene exhaled out of your dennes.

N. Secondly, the *People* are scandalized at the *Crosse*, in that they feare it will bring backe *Poperie*, and *Israel* into *Egypt*: forasmuch as it doth tempt and moue vs to *Idolatrie*.

I. It may mone by accident but not of it selfe: As the beholding of our naked Churches may moue an ignorant old man to consider the gorgeous Ornaments in Poperie: and peraduenture to bewaile the want of Images and Pictures then in vse. Such vaine surmises as these had long agoe beene remoued, if with the shew of lenitie, wee had not tolerated the bellowes of Sedition. For as the austeritie of women driueth away Adulterers; So the Seueritie of Gouernours silenceth the factious.

N. As *within*; so *without the Church* many are offended with the *Crosse*, both *friends* and *aduersaries*. *Our friends* of the *Reformed Churches* haue abolished the *same*: and therefore cannot approue in *vs* the toleration *thereof*.

I. If these Churches differing from vs in matters of great moment (as appeares in the questions touching the Hierarchie, Tithes,

and

and the like) doe yet notwithstanding account vs their friend: How much more will they endure our dissenting from them in a matter indifferent as is the Crosse? Rome and Millaine may haue diuers Rites, and yet but one faith.

N. Our *Aduersaries* both *Barrowists* and *Papists*, by our vse of the *Crosse*, receiue no small *Scandall*.

I. The Learned in both these factions may not bee accounted weake: and so cannot bee offended. The number and worth of Brownists vnlearned is no way to bee equallized in matter of offence, to Our State and Multitude. As for the vnlearned Papists, I thus retort their argument. To remoue the Crosse being a thing indifferent, should haue beene a thing Scandalous at the entrance of the Gospel, forasmuch as the greatest part of the Land was thẽ Popishly addicted. So, that if nothing had beene yeelded to their infirmitie, they would haue degenerated from Poperie to Atheisme. Neither is the remouall thereof now lesse offensiue. For innouation in things indifferent, without important necessitie, is perilous both to the State and Church. Thus your arguments, which afarre off, seemed to bee like a great ship, being nearly and narrowly viewed, are found to bee nothing but certaine logs floating vpon the water.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Of Confirmation.

N. THe first *Sacrament of Infants* (namely Baptisme) being handled: The second followeth, namely, *Confirmation.*

I. **Forasmuch as wee make only** Two Sacraments generally necessary to salvation: (Baptisme, **and the** Lord's Supper) **why haue you here ranked** Confirmation?

N. Not onely because, by your *Assertion*, it appertaineth to *Children* as well as *Baptisme:* nor yet because it is made a *preparation* to the *Communion*, and so should come before it (for we well approue of the *preparatiue examination* of *Children* before *the receiuing* of *the Communion*) but principally, for that you both make it *a Sacrament:* yea, and preferre it before *Baptisme*. The *former* whereof appeareth in that you doe ascribe vnto it (*in the second Prayer*) both a *visible signe*, and *an inuisible grace.* The *Signe* you make *the imposition of hands.* The *grace you intend* is the *increase* and *strengthning* of those *gifts* of the *Spirit*, which were conferred in *Baptisme.*

I. **Concerning the** name of Sacrament, **we doe not greatly contend. But for the** signe, **we** first

first produce that famous Catechisme of the Author to the Hebrewes, whereof Six Principles are propounded: Two internall (Repentance, and Faith:) Two externall (Baptisme and Imposition of hands:) Two Eternall (the *Resurrection* and the Iudgement.) *Heb.6.1,2.*

N. Imposition there mentioned belongs to *Orders*, not to *Confirmation*.

I. Your Catechisme differs from ours: For you, supposing Discipline to bee an essentiall part of the Gospel, teach it your Children euen amongst the swadling bands of their first rudiments. But wee thus reason against your exposition of this place. Imposition of hands in Orders belongs not to the Principles of Religion; to be deliuered to them that are Neophytes and Catechumeni (that is, Nouices in Religion:) But the imposition here meant is such: and therefore cannot agree to Orders, but rather to Confirmation: Of which euen Children may be partakers.

N. Your *Maior* is vntrue: For *Church Discipline* (and consequently *Orders*) belong partly to the *fift Commandement*: partly, to the *Second Petition*: and therefore may not bee excluded out of the *Catechisme*.

I. The Obedience to Magistrates doth belong also to the Fift Precept. This Obedience cannot bee exactly knowne without vnderstanding the Positiue Lawes of the Country: Would you haue these Lawes also inserted into the Catechisme.

N.

N. A *generall*, and *confused knowledge* of this *obedience*, and of the *nature of Lawes* is sufficient for them that are *newly Catechized.*

I. So we thinke their heads should not bee molested with intricate scruples about Discipline: whereof one is the imposition of hands in Orders. As for your fancie touching the second Petition, it is lighter then vanitie. Secondly, we produce the practice of Christ in imposing hands vpon [a] Infants.

See before in in the *Letanie.*

a *Math.* 19. 13, 15.

N. We doe not so much insist vpon the *signe* as vpon the *inward grace*, for which you haue no warrant.

I. We haue a warrant signed from the highest authoritie: For first, if Christ laid hands vpon Children to pray for them: thinke you that his Prayer did returne emptie without some spirituall grace? Is the Praier of [b] a righteous Elder so forcible for the Sicke, and was not Christ's Prayer effectuall for the Sound? Did not the Apostle confirme men with Spirituall gifts?

b *Iames* 5. 14. & 16.

c *Acts* 8. 16, 17 & 14. 22. & 15 26. & 16. 5. *Rom.* 1. 11.

N. The *Apostles* had power to giue the *Holy Ghost:* Our *Bishops* cannot claime the like *priuiledge.*

I. Doe you meane, they cannot giue the Holy Ghost in Orders?

N. Of that wee shall intreate elsewhere. My meaning is: they cannot grant the *strengthning* of *spirituall grace* to *Children.*

I. Could the Priests of the Law to put Gods

Name

Name vpon the Children of Israel, that thereupon [d] he blessed them? And shall not our Euangelicall Bishops, with Prayer and Imposition of hands obtaine the increase of diuine grace? Thinke you they are all vnrighteous men, and that their Prayer is abominable?

d *Numb.* 6. 27.

N. What we thinke of *their persons* you must pardon if we vtter not.

I. There is no need of that: the Land crawleth with Libels.

N. Wee are displeased if any of *our brethren* haue beene vntemperate herein: But to returne to *Confirmation*: If in it there bee both a *signe*, and a *spirituall grace*; why is it not a *Sacrament* properly so called?

I. Either because Imposition of hands, which is the signe thereof, is not proper to the same, but common to Orders with it; Or rather because Confirmation, is not generally necessarie to Saluation: I meane in that degree of necessitie which is found in Baptisme, and the Lords Supper.

N. It may seeme probable, that if *Strength* and *Perseuerance* be giuen by it, it should be euen *generally necessary*.

I. First, it is not so directly enioyned as our two generall Sacraments be: Secondly, many Children dying before they haue need of Confirmation, are yet most iustly reputed as actuall partakers of eternall life.

N. That *Confirmation* may in a *large sence*

be called a *Sacramentall mysterie* is very much. But that it should bee preferred before *Baptisme* is intolerable: Considering also that you contradict your selues herein.

I. You must first declare how it appeareth that we aduance it aboue Baptisme.

N. Not only aboue *Baptisme*, but euen aboue the *Lord's Supper*: For it is permitted to each *Deacon* to administer your *Baptisme*: But the *Communion* in *both kindes*, may not be celebrated by any vnder *the degree of a Priest*: *Confirmation* is allowed *onely to Bishops*: whereby the *Dignitie* and *Order* of these *Sacraments* is manifest.

I. Why did you then place it before the Communion?

N. It was conuenient to set it immediately after *Baptisme*, because it seemeth to bee a kinde of *Baptisme* it selfe: onely of a more excellent degree, as being administred by a *Degree* of a *more noble account.*

I. I pray you declare vnto me, why is the Head more noble then the Bodie?

N. The *Bodie* toucheth only, the *Head* both *toucheth* and *tasteth* and hath other *Senses.*

I. The heart only toucheth: The tongue both toucheth and tasteth: Is it therefore more noble then the heart?

N. In a man it speaketh also: and so is *more noble.*

I. But what say you to the tongue of a beast?

N. It is not *more noble* then the *heart* by it selfe: but as it is a part of the *head*.

I. Will you conclude then that tasting is better then touching?

N. Nothing lesse: For *touching* is the *roote*, and *first borne* of *sense*: yet *touching* with *tasting* is more excellent then *simple touching*.

I. In like manner though Baptisme be most necessarie (because Children baptized haue all things necessary to Saluation) yet Baptisme, ioyned with Confirmation, is more excellent then simple Baptisme. No maruell then though it be assigned to a more excellent degree, that is, the Episcopall; Especially seeing that Philip though hee preached and baptized, yet might not confirme: this being reserued for the Apostles. And now tell me, where is our Contradiction? *Acts 8.16.*

N. You contradict your selues both in regard of your *Doctrine* and *Practice*. For the *first*; you teach that *Children baptized haue all things necessary for saluation*: which if it bee true, then *what need of Confirmation?*

I. Had the Israelites in the Wildernesse, all things needfull to Saluation?

N. They had: else their sinne should not want *excuse*.

I. They had only the the fiue Bookes of *Moses*: were these sufficient to saluation?

N. They were *for that time*.

I. What then? were Iosua, and the other Bookes needlesse?

N. They were also needfull in their season.

I. In like manner Baptisme of Infants is sufficient to them for eternall life, if they die incontinently after Baptisme: Nevertheless, if they come to yeares, both Confirmation, and the Lords Supper may bee necessarie euen as repentance, and the hearing of Sermons may not by you bee affirmed to bee needlesse to the purchase of heauen.

N. Againe you contradict your selues in *practice*: For which of your *Prelates* doth vrge or vse *Confirmation?*

I. To reason from Practice to Lawes, doth argue but a distempered mind. Now the reason why the Fathers of our Church doe not so often Confirme Children, is partly drawne from the shortnesse of time, wherein they hold their Seates: partly from the infinite molestations, with which they are infested: but principally from the obstinacie of the People, who disdaine these things: And no marvell, considering your Frogges are permitted to croake in each Chamber.

CHAP.

Chap. XV.

Of the Lords Supper.

N. YOu may mis-tearme vs at your pleasure. Nevertheless I proceed from the *Sacraments* appertaining to *Children*, (Namely, *Baptisme* and *Confirmation*) to *those* which belong to *men of yeares* (Namely, the *Communion*, and *Penance*) whereof the *former* belongs to *men in health*: and the *latter* to *sicke men onely*.

I. Doe not wee also minister the Communion to the Sicke?

N. So you doe indeed: as also you make it *an appendix to Matrimony*: But of these wee shall intreate in their due places. Now wee returne to your *Publique Communion*: wherein *three things* wee dislike: whereof *two* come before; the *third* is in the *act* of *receiving*. Of those that come before, this is the *former*. (*Least after the taking of that holy Sacrament, the Deuill enter as he entred into Iudas*) by which wordes you intimate that *Iudas* received the *Lords Supper*, which is vntrue.

I. What then did he receiue?

N. He was only partaker of the *Passeouer*.

I. Be it so (as you affirme) yet is our argument most firme; for if Satan entred into Iudas, because hee did unworthily receiue the Passeouer (which was immediately to be abrogated) what punishment shall abide vs, if wee doe not duly partake of that Sacrament which shall not be altered till the Second Comming of Christ? But now let vs heare how you proue that Iudas did not receiue the Lords Supper.

N. The *Sop* was before the *Communion* (as being a part of the Passeouer.) For *Luke* saith, the *Communion* was celebrated after the *Supper* (meaning the [a] Passeouer:) But immediately after the receiuing of the *Sop* [b] *Iudas* departed, and therefore could not bee made partaker of the *Communion.*

a *Luke* 22.20.
b *John* 13.30.

I. How doth it appeare that the Sop was a part of the Passeouer?

N. The *Iewish Rabbins* declare, that a *Cake* was broken at the *beginning of the Passeouer* into two pieces, whereof *the one* was eaten *before*, the *other* after *the Paschall Lambe*, *both* dipped in sawce of [c] *sower hearbs.*

c *Exod.* 12.8.

I. Of the hearbs I reade in Scripture, but neither of the sawce, nor of the cake.

N. It seemes that *Christ* receiued it from some *Tradition of the Elders*, who by their discretion did apportionate this *Cake*, and *Sawce*, to the Hearbs mentioned in the *Law.*

I. Could the Elders in the Synagogue appoint ex-

externall Ceremonies in God's ſeruice beſides the letter of the Law? And will you make Our Church like the ſeruile wife of a Ruffian, not attempting to order the moſt indifferent things without expreſſe warrant from her husband? And now to returne to Iudas. How will you ſatisfie this argument? After Supper was the [d] Communion celebrated: after which yet followed the words of Christ, The hand of him that [e] betrayeth me, is with me at the table. It ſeemeth then that Iudas was preſent at the Communion.

d *Luke* 22. 20.

e *Luke* 22 21. and therefore ἐδίδοτων *Mat.* 26. 26. is to be tranſlated not *comedentibus*, but *cum comedissent* being the ſecond Aoriſt.

N. There is an *Hyſteroſis* in the *Story* of *Luke*. For *Matthew* (recording the ſame words) doth repeat them before *the administring of the Communion*. The like *Prepoſteration* is ſeene in the *temptations of Christ*.

I. It would trouble you to tell, which temptation was the ſecond: which the third: and whither the Hyſteroſis were in Matthew, or in Luke. The like may be ſaid of this Story. Thus you perceiue, for ought that you haue alleaged, your opinion is but probable in this matter: and yet (as I before declared) our Liturgie doth not contradict you.

N. The *ſecond thing* that we diſlike, is that *you allow the Confeſſion before the Communion* to bee vttered by any one of the *Communicants*, in the *name of the reſt*, whereby a *priuate man or woman* is made the *mouth of the Congregation*.

N. The meaning of the Rubricke is this? That

See more chapter 5.

That one (at the least) necessarily shall ioyne with the Priest. If all doe it voluntarily, they shall not bee prohibited, as appeares by our Daily Practice.

N. In your *receiuing* of the *Communion* wee disallow your *Idolatrous kneeling*.

I. When we pray, kneeling is a gesture most conuenient. But in the receiuing wee doe pray by the commandement of the Church. For both the Minister prayeth, and wee also are commanded to receiue it with thankesgiuing, why? is a kind of Prayer: and therefore kneeling cannot be denied to be expedient.

N. Your *Maior* is not firme: For I suppose that few are accustomed to *kneele* when they *giue thankes* at meate.

I. You reason from a short Prayer to one of a more determinate nature: From a Prayer in priuate businesse, to one that is annexed to Gods solemne seruice: And (which is worst) when we argue of expediencie, you inuert the state of the question, as though wee reasoned about necessitie. In summe, wee say that to kneele in Prayer is, though not alwayes necessarie, yet for the most part expedient: as being the most significant symbole of that reuerence, which the creature should exhibit to God in supplication.

N. But your *Minor* also faileth: For although wee will not simply denie, that the *Church* may ordaine *Prayers*: yet, that *Solitarie Prayer* may be

be vsed in the *Church* (which is the *place* assigned for *Publique Prayer*) it seemeth vnreasonable.

I. Herein you commit a double errour: First, in that you imagine a man may not vse Solitary Prayer in the Church: which is refuted both by Salomons Prayer and by Christ's [f] Parable.

f 1. *Kings* 8.41 & 43. *Luke* 18.10. & 13.

N. What then? Doe you commend them, which in the time of *Publique Prayer*, betake themselues to *their priuate deuotions*.

I. Nothing lesse: And yet, if either before or after: or in the intermission of Solemne Seruice, men turne themselues to Prayer, wee cannot but commend it. Neither may we condemne those men, which suddenly entring into a Church (in the midst of Diuine Seruice or of a Sermon, doe with a short, and quicke Prayer, addresse and sanctifie themselues to the solemne action in hand. Your second errour is, that you make some pretended action to bee interrupted by this Prayer: whereas indeed, like as the Sacrament is particularly administred to euery man: so each man is bound to particularize and apply to himselfe the Sacramentall benefit by deuout inuocation of Gods name. And certainly if Singing may concurre with Receiuing: why may not Prayer, whereof Singing is one kinde. Furthermore for kneeling I thus reason: An action indifferent, determined by lawfull authoritie, is to bee performed: But such is kneeling at the Communion;

And therefore may not bee refuſed.'

N. Your *Maior* holdeth not in caſe of *Scandall.*

I. This was before anſwered in the Croſſe, when we treated of Baptiſme.

N. Yea, but your *Minor* is to be denied for *two cauſes:* Firſt, *That which Chriſt did not, wee may not doe: But Chriſt did not kneele at his Supper, And therefore it is vnlawfull to bee done by vs.*

I. Your reaſon ſtands all of Negatiues, an old errour in your Logique.

N. The *Minor* may bee negatiue; becauſe the *Maior* is a *Relatiue.*

I. You ſhould doe better to conuert your Maior: and then your reaſon will be formall: But before you change it, marke the falſhood of it: Chriſt did not baptize? Might our Miniſters refuſe to baptize any, leſt they ſhould doe that which Chriſt neuer did?

John 4. 2.

N. Becauſe you ſo much inſiſt vpon *formalitie*, I will turne my *Maior.*

I. You haue ſo long reſiſted the formalities of Orders, that you dare not inſiſt vpon the formalities of Art: And generally it may be obſerued that through a froward kinde of idleneſſe, you haue made Arts Eunuches.

N. I returne to my *Argument, That which Chriſt did we muſt doe. But Chriſt did ſit at his Supper: We therefore ought to ſit:* And, by *conſequent*, not to *kneele.*

I. First, your Maior wants armour of proofe: For Christ did some things miraculous as God (As fasting fortie dayes, walking vpon the water, and the like:) Some things as Mediatour (Namely, as Dying for Mankinde:) Some things Ceremoniall (as when he was Circumcised, and receiued the Passeouer) because he was subiect to the Law.

N. Why doe you fetch such a compasse? We speake of *Christ's* morall *actions*, which bee our *imitation*.

I. You haue set yet to large a compasse: For Christ did morally some actions in a double manner: Namely, some as necessarie: some as indifferent: Of the first kinde are those which the Law commanded to which hee subiected himselfe (as when he went about doing good:) Of the latter sort are those, which are left free to man's arbitrement (as namely when he both sat, and stood at seuerall times of his preaching:) In summe, that which Christ commanded to be done, is necessarily imitable.

N. Nay, *that which Christ did* if it be possible, and conuenient to be *done*, doth require our *imitation*.

I. Why then doe wee not receiue the Communion after Supper, at Night, with vnleauened bread, our feet first washt.

N. These things are not iudged *conuenient*, and therefore not vrged.

I. The like may bee affirmed of sitting,

being a thing no more commanded then the rest.

N. It is thought *expedient:* because it signifieth *our rest*, and *spirituall familiaritie* with God.

I. This figure is of your owne erection. For was not this rest aswell presented in the Passeouer, as in the Lord's Supper: And yet it is gathered by the Storie: that the Hebrewes did stand at the eating of the g Lambe.

g *Exod.* 12.11.

N. The first time of the *Passeouer* (being in *Egypt*) did require *standing* as most *conuenient:* forasmuch as then they were not *in rest*, but *hastening their departure:* For when they came to *their rest in Canaan:* it appeares by the *Storie of Christ* that they did *sit* at the h *Passeouer.*

h *Mat.* 26.20.

I. It seemes then that was indifferent, whether they did stand or sit: And so your allegorie is as sicke as a Quaile: Againe, might not some Israelite haue thus reasoned in Egypt: This Passeouer is a figure of our heauenly rest, and therefore wee should sit, and not stand: Might not Caleb or Ioshua when they were come to the Land of Canaan, haue thus argued. This Lambe is a remembrance of our hasty comming out of the land of *Egypt:* Therefore wee should not sit at our ease, but stand, like men in haste: Or thus: This is a remembrance of our Egyptiacall seruice: Therefore we should stand like slaues; and not sit like freemen. Would these Arguments haue beene currant at that time.

N

N. Sitting at Supper is most conuenient: and therefore *at the Lords Supper.*

I. Is not our Communion answerable to the Passouer? Was not that a Supper appointed by God, as well as this? And yet (as your selfe lately confessed) they stood in Egypt at the eating of the Paschall Lambe.

N. Yea, but the *Communion* is directly called a [i] *Supper:* and therefore *sitting*, being a *gesture* vsed at *ordinarie Suppers*, is here also *Conuenient.*

i 1.*Cor.*11.20.

I. Is not the Passeouer likewise called a [k] Supper, and yet they stood at the eating thereof? Besides, though Christ receiued it after Supper, yet, partly for the abuse of [l] Loue-Feasts: and partly because men were accustomed to receiue it fasting: the Communion was translated from Euening to Morning: and Loue-Feasts were abolisht. So that if you tearme the Eucharist a Supper; you shall doe it, neither in regard of the time: nor of the circumstance of a meale: but onely in remembrance of the first institution. And therefore, although it were granted that Christ did sit, because hee was set before at Supper: yet this situation cannot be inforced vpon vs as necessarie, forasmuch as we receiue it at the time of Breakfast (when men rather vse to stand then sit) not of Supper.

k *Luke* 22.20.

l 2.*Pet.*2.13. *Iude* 12 compared with 1.*Cor.* 11.21.

N. Wee like of *standing*, better then of *kneeling.*

I.

I. **Remember** your owne Argument: What Christ did not, we must not doe: But Christ did not stand (for you auouch that he sat:) standing therefore is vnlawfull? **Or** (**as your selfe inuerted the** reason:) What Christ did, wee must doe: But Christ did sit (as you auerre) wee must therefore sit, and not stand. **These are** children **of your** owne: **and therefore you must be** at the cost **of their** education.

N. Some *Reformed Churches* vse *Standing*, as well as *Sitting*.

I. **I could vse a reason of your** owne Logick, **thus: a** situation, **which is not** sitting, **is lawfull at the** Communion: (**for you grant** standing **to bee a** thing indifferent, **and therefore** lawfull:) **But** kneeling **is such a** situation. **And** therefore most lawfull. **And thus farre of your** Maior: **though this also might bee added: That it is** weakenesse **to argue from** decencie in ordinary Suppers, **to that** comelinesse **which is meete at the** Lords Table. **For it is** decent **to come hungry to a** bodily supper, **which** Saint Paul **allowethnot at** the Lords Supper. **Would you haue men** couer their heads, **vse** trenchers, knives, **and other** such appurtenances **at the** Communion? **But now to your** Minor, **wherein you affirme that** Christ **did sit at the** Communion. First, **wee desire to know that place where this is auoucht.**

Negatio infinitans negationem simplicem non efficit.

1. *Cor.* 11. 21.

Math. 26. 20.

N. Is it not plaine in the *Storie?*

I. **It is plaine that he sat at the** Passeouer: **which**

which Saint Luke calleth the Supper: after which the same Euangelist reporteth, hee instituted the Sacrament: and so for ought you can bring to the contrarie, he did rise from Supper: and so might either stand or kneele: And his kneeling is more probable: because he blessing the Bread, may be thought to haue prayed kneeling.

N. *Christ* vsed at *other Suppers* to sit: and *therefore it is likely that he did so here likewise.*

I. When he fed many thousands with a few loaues, did he sit, or stand?

N. It is not expressed, and therefore is vncertaine.

I. Was this a Supper: or not?

N. It was *an euening repast:* and so may bee tearmed a *Supper.*

I. By your owne words then it is cleare: how vncertaine it is, whether Christ sate at euery supper. So that, if you make your reason perfect, the errour will bee manifest: For example: That which Christ did at euery supper: that hee did at this: But hee sate at euery supper: And therefore at this also. Your Minor (as you see) is ambiguous, and cannot vniuersally be confirmed. Your Maior also is incoherent, because it is not necessary he should do all things at this extraordinary supper, which hee did at the times of his common refection. But the truth is, that hee did ordaine the Sacrament after Supper: And therefore it is stiled

led a Supper, only by a Figure.

N. It is likely that being *set* at the *Passeouer*, hee would not *rise* till he had appointed the *Sacrament*.

I. I shewed you before the vnlikelihood thereof: And from likelihood to reason to necessitie is a bondage, which the meaneſt wits will not endure.

N. It is generally granted that *Christ* sat at *his owne Supper*.

I. It is granted by the most, that he sate, as he did at the Passeouer: would you be content to sit in the like manner? would you haue three beds set about your Communion Table? would you that your neighbour should leane vpon your breast, as Iohn did vpon Christs?

Iohn 13.23. N. Tell mee (I pray you:) what *bread* vsed *Christ* at his *Supper*?

I. Vnleauened bread: for there was no other to be had at the Passeouer.

N. Is it not then lawfull for vs to vse *leauened bread?*

I. We ought to vse the ordinary bread of the countrey: whether leauened or vnleauened it is not materiall.

N. In like manner *Sitting* is necessary: But the order of *sitting*, whether *Iewish* (vpon beds) or *Turkish* (vpon carpets spread on the ground) or according to the *custome* of *Europe*: is left to vs as *indifferent* and *arbitrarie*.

I. When you can proue sitting to be as ne-

cessari.

ceſſarie as the bread in the Sacrament, then will we grant, that you may ſit after the Turkiſh or Iewiſh fashion.

N. *Chriſts ſitting* differed from that which we contend for, onely by *accident*, not *eſſentially*: For *leaning* is but *an accident* of *ſitting*.

I. In what Category is ſitting to be placed?

N. In the Ninth; which is called *Situs*, or *Situation*.

I. Is not leaning a kind of ſituation alſo?

N. It is *a ſituation-partiall*, not *totall*, that is, of a *part*, not of the *whole bodie*.

I. How differeth Vbi from Situs?

N. Vbi is the applying of *place* to the *whole bodie*: *Situs* of the parts thereof.

I. Of all, or of ſome?

N. I thinke of *all*.

I. You may not thinke ſo: vnleſſe you imagine that ſitting differeth not from ſtanding? conſidering that all the parts receiue not a diuerſe ſituation in theſe two.

N. What if I grant that *leaning* is a *kind* of *ſituation*?

I. Attend to this Argument: Two Species of the ſame kinde differ eſſentially, not by accident: But, ſitting and leaning are two ſpecies of the ſame kinde (namely, of ſituation:) And therefore your ſitting differeth from that of Chriſt's eſſentially.

N. *Situations* are but *accidents*: and therefore can differ but *by accident*.

Scaliger exercitation. 325. Sect. 2.

I. Situation is an accident to the subiect (namely to the bodie) and yet essentiall to sitting & leaning (being the kinds thereof) whereby your sitting doth as essentially differ from Christs action, as our kneeling.

N. Were it granted that *Christ* did not *sit*, yet *kneeling* is vnlawfull because it was appointed by a *Pope* for the honour of the *Idolatrous Artolatry:* And therefore, being *scandalous*, doth cease to be *indifferent.*

Honorius, Anno Dom. 1220.

I. Concerning Scandall, wee spake before in the Crosse. Touching your consequence, I intreated in your first generall obiection: But your antecedent is also deceitfull: for our kind of kneeling, was not ordained by the Pope, as may thus appeare. Popish kneeling (or kneeling ordained by the Pope, was, and is, for the honour of the Breaden God: But, our bowing of the knee is not such; And therefore cannot be Popish.

N. The tearme *Popish* may be taken in a *double sense: Directly* or *Indirectly: Directly*, when *Idolatrie* is intended by the *Whole Visible Congregation: Indirectly*, when *some one receiuer* against the *common intention of the Church* doth idolatrously worship the *bread:* Or thus: *Directly*, when the worship of some *Idoll* is plainly put in practice: *Indirectly:* when for the *present*, it is not practiced *in grosse manner*, but creepeth on (as *abuses* doe) by *stealing*, and *insensible steps:* Like as the *setting vp of Images* in the *Church* (although not then adored) did in pro-

ceſſe of time, produce *Open Idolatry*.

I. These two ſhifts make you relapſe into the queſtion of Scandall, of which we treated before in the Croſſe.

N. Then I ſay, that *your kneeling*, is directly *Popiſh*, and *Idolatrous*, as may thus *firſt* appeare: *To worſhip God, in, at, or before a Creature, is Idolatrie, and Poperie: But ſuch is your kneeling*, Ergo.

I. You ioyne Idolatrie and Poperie, as if they ſounded all one thing: whereas many kinds of Idolatrie bee not Popiſh: and many Papiſticall things haue no agreement with Idols. But to your Maior: May not wee worſhip God in the Earth, at a Church, before Angels and Men: and are not theſe Creatures? Indeed to aſcribe inherent or reflexiue holines to Creatures in God's worſhip, is a kind of Idolatrie: But yet to denie that they haue holineſſe by aſſiſtance, is meere way-wardneſſe.

N. Secondly, I thus argue: *To worſhip Chriſts manhood as preſent, when indeed it is abſent; is Idolatry: But ſuch is your kneeling:* Ergo.

I. Were your Maior true, then none ſhould worſhip Chriſts manhood, but thoſe that had ſeene him walke vpon the earth: or thoſe that triumph with him in heauen: whereas indeed we are bound to worſhip the Whole Perſon of Chriſt, and conſequently his Manhood. As for your Minor, it is moſt weake: for men may kneele without conſideration of Chriſt's Manhood: I meane it was poſſible before Chriſt's

John 9.38. *Epheſ.*1.21,22. *Heb.*1.6.

ming, though now it bee vnlawfull: For to worship halfe Christ is partly Heresie; partly, Idolatrie. Besides your argument, may bee thus retorted vpon you. Where, by the vnion of the spirit, Christ, and God are present, with a gracious presence, there to kneele praying is lawfull. But so it is in the Sacrament (for the Spirit assisting the bread vniteth vs to Christs Manhood, and so to his Godhead, and consequently the Deitie of the Father:) Our kneeling therefore cannot but be lawfull.

N. By this reason, men should *kneele* at a *Sermon*: for there also is the *Spirit* present.

I. If men could pray and heare at once, kneeling were not there vnlawfull.

N. Another thing in the *receiuing* wee dislike, that you say *Christs Bodie and Bloud*, is *verily* and *indeed* receiued of the *faithfull*.

I. These words verily and indeed, refute the common errour, making Sacraments bare signes: But these, of the faithfull, refell the Lutheran and Papist, who make the Reprobate, as well as the Elect, partakers of Christ.

Chap. XVI.

Of the Visitation of the Sicke.

N. FRom the *Sacrament* (belonging to the *Sound*) I passe to the *Visitation of the Sicke*, which is compounded of two *corrupted Sacraments*, *Priuate Communion*, and *Penance*. In the *former* we dislike the *necessitie*, and *Priuateneſſe* thereof. Touching *the necessitie*, wee marueil much: that you make it a thing so needfull to saluation.

1. Besides my former arguments vsed in Baptisme, I adde first this distinction: That a thing needfull to saluation is either a proper working cause thereof: Or any thing that is helpfull, and comfortably expedient to the same. In this latter sense, we speake of Sacraments; as also of good workes: Secondly, I propound this reason: That thing whereby ordinarily Gods Spirit is conuayed (namely, by the way of assistance only) to strengthen our faith against daily suddaine temptations, that thing is needfull and helpfull to saluation: But such is the Eucharist: *Ergo.*

N. Though we should grant that in this sense the *Sacrament* is needfull: yet *the necessitie there-*

of is to much vrged when it is giuen in *priuate*.

I. Doe you call it priuate in regard of Place, or Person?

N. In both respects.

I. First, for Place: I haue declared in Baptisme, that Sacraments may bee in priuate administred: Secondly, in regard of the Person, they can by no pretence bee so tearmed: both because the Person administring is Publique? As also, because a priuate Communion is so called, when the Priest alone doth receiue the Sacrament in both kindes, the people in the meane time gazing, as fruitlesse spectators: Or if they communicate, being bereaued of the Cup: whereas with vs, not only the Minister, but euen the sicke man: and as many assistants as can be conueniently assembled, doe receiue in both kinds.

N. From *Priuate Communion* then, let vs come to your *Popish Penance*: For although you make no mention of *Contrition*, or of *Auricular Confession*, yet *Absolution* you absolutely retaine.

At the Conference in *Hampton* Court.

N. Tell mee I pray you, why some of your combination, desired to haue the Absolution tearmed a Remission?

N. Because *Absolution* implyeth *forgiuing of sinnes with authoritie*: *Remission onely* by the way of *Declaration*: whereof this *latter* may be permitted to *men*: but *the former* is peculiar to *God*: and therefore you are in this point too

too much *the Apes of Poperie*.

I. Let the Papists eate their owne Crabs, which they haue caught: Only it were to be wished, that men by telling needlesse falshoods; would not discredit themselues in the most needfull truthes. But to let them passe? as also your distinction of Absolution, and Remission, not worth the refuting: Wee auouch that pardoning of sinnes with authoritie is double. Namely, with authority absolute, or delegate: The former is Gods prerogatiue: The latter is in the Charter of the Church. For I demand, If a Murther be committed, doth the Prince onely declaratiuely pardon or condemne the offender? Doth he not also the same with authoritie delegate from God? May any priuate man well skilled in Lawes, and most able to declare the merit or demerit of the partie delinquent, attempt this thing without authoritie? Is not the difference betweene authoritie and declaration manifest?

N. I will not be endangered with these *matters of State.*

I. No maruell: For many of your wing haue succeeded but ill with them.

N. Returne I pray you to the matter: How proue you that *Ministers* may *pardon sinnes* with *authoritie?*

I. They to whom the Keyes are deliuered, and the power of binding and loosing [m] sinnes, may absolue sinners; not onely declaratiuely, but

m *Mat.16.19. & 18.18. Iob 20.23.*

but euen with authority. But these things are giuen to the Ministers of the Church. They therefore may absolue with authoritie.

N. They may absolue (by the *preaching* of the *Word*) *sinnes in generall:* but they may not apply their *Absolution* to *particular men*, because they cannot know *their speciall repentance*, whether it be *sound* or hollow.

I. That they may particularize their censures, appeares by the words of [n] Nathan, [o] Elihu, and Saint [p] Paul. For what? May they not excommunicate particular [q] men? Can they binde and not loose? Is loosing any other thing then Absolution? As for your Confirmation it is most infirme. For were it sound; we should not ordinarily administer the Sacraments to any; forasmuch as we are ignorant whether mens faith be entire; or only in collusion of appearance. These fancies doe smell of Swingfeldius and H. N. and taste, not only of a desire of noueltie, but euen of anarchie. So that with equall vanitie you haue condemned both our generall Absolution: and our tearme of Penance in the Collect vpon Mid-lom-mer Day.

n 2. *Sam* 12.13
o *Iob* 33.23,24
p 1. *Cor.* 5.1.
q *Math.* 18.17.

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

Of Matrimonie.

N. FRom your *Sacraments* I proceed to your *Rites:* which seeme to bee *certaine customes*, not *Sacramentall*; And belong either to the *liuing* (as *Marriage:* and *Churching*) or to the *Dead* (as *Buriall:*) *Marriage* is a bond *most honorable.* Concerning the *bond* you erre *two wayes:* First, you *straightly charge the parties*, that if they know *any impediment*, they *confesse it.*

I. **For asmuch as many thousands of your time, haue beene** publiquely married, **neuer stumbling at** these words: **I maruell what** new mysterie, **you haue here digged vp?**

N. Wee vnderstand; that some of your men vrge these words, for the *Defence* of the Oath *ex officio*, which is to vs a *Scourge* and a *Scorpion.*

I. **Neuertheless we may iustly vrge it: For what is the** Oath ex Officio, **but the** adiuring **of men** to confesse things tending to their owne damage in appearance: **howsoeuer indeed they further both** Truth and Charitie.

N. But what *Scriptures* can you alleadge for this *Antichristian oath.*

I. If you meane that it was ante Christum; before Christ: You shall heare not onely that [r] Saul, a wicked Prince, charged his people with an oath: Nor yet only that good Iosh[ua] did vrge [s] Achan to confesse a sin against himself: no nor yet that Ioseph (at least according to your owne interpretation vpon the Letanie,) did adiure his brethren to bring Beniamin (for though these were holy men, yet they might erre) but euen the neuer failing Law of God, commanding the Priest to charge the woman (suspected of adultery) by an [t] oath to confesse her owne fault, if any such had beene. But if you meane that it is Antichristian, because against Christ, it was vsed by the [u] High Priest: Remember withall that Christ obayed it: which he would not haue done had it proceeded from Antichrist, as you pretend. Nay, if we be bound to giue a [x] reason of our faith to euerie man that demandeth it, how shall we presume to hide the truth from our lawfull Superiours?

r 1. Sam. 14. 24.

s Iosh. 7. 19.

t Numb. 5. 19.

u Math. 26. 63.

x 1. Pet. 3. 15.

N. To grant (for the present) that the *Bishops* are our *Superiours* lawfully ordained: yet they may not vnlawfully proceed against vs: Seeing God hath appointed, that *by the mouth of two or three witnesses, euery matter should be confirmed.*

y Deut. 19. 15.

I. Indeed, when a man is accused, another testimonie is needfull: But when presumptuous circumstances concurre, then either of e witnesse is sufficient, (as wee reade in the Storie of [z] Ester) or else, though there bee no wit-

z Ester 2. 21.

witneſſe, yet iudgement may paſſe (as we find [a] the hiſtorie of the women which came before Salomon:) But why may not confeſſion be extorted from men, aſwell by the reuerence of an oath, as by torments, in caſe of treaſon? Or by a man's owne folly (as in the ſtorie [b] of the Amalekite:) Neither is this a ſeruile betraying of a mans owne Perſon, but a neceſſary bewraying of the truth, which wee ought to preferre before our owne liues.

a 1. *Kings* 3.27

b 2 *Sam.*1.16.

N. Your *ſecond errour* in the *bond of marriage* is, that you make it *indiſſoluble*: for you ſay *that it ſhall neuer bee lawfull to put them aſunder, &c.*

I. What lawfull cauſes of ſeparation can you forge?

N. The *cauſes* (without *forgerie*) are two, which concerne either the *efficient cauſe*, or the *matter*: Of the *firſt kind* is the *conſent of Parents*, without which notwithanding you ratifie ſundrie *Marriages*.

I. First, although the conſent of Parents, bee requiſite to the making of Matrimonie, yet, if it be once conſummated, the want of it makes not this a nullitie: Secondly, in ſome caſes Marriage is not only effectuall, but euen lawfull without this conſent; As, in caſe the Father will not indure his Childe, to marrie any ſaue an Heretique, or notoriouſly wicked perſon; And if the Childe, after the yeares of diſcretion, can neither with long ſtrife reſtrain burning, nor by himſelfe or friends

Et Validum: & Licitum.

euer intreate his Father; or if the Magistrate interpose his authoritie herein, the Marriage (without Parents consent) in such a case shall be ratified both in earth and heauen.

N. The cause drawne from the *matter*, belongs, either to the *whole person*, or *some part thereof*. Of the *former kind* is that case *when there is an errour in the Person*: As when *Leah* came to *Iacob* in stead of *Rahell*.

I. If the Law doe herein determine (Seperation (as you tearme it) vpon iust triall of vniust collution: The reason is, because the parties by God were neuer conioyned; As for example, Iacob because hee neuer promised Marriage to Leah, was not in rigour bound to confirme her single fact.

N. The *cause* drawne from the *parts* of the *Person*, doth either appertaine to the *Bodie*, or the *Soule*: And further, to the *bodie*, either *liuing* or *dead*: In the *liuing bodie* may be a *Defect*, or a *Disease*: Of the *first kind* is that, when a man is an *Eunuch*, or an *Hermaphrodite*: Of *the latter sort* is the *Leprosie*, *falling Sickenesse*, or any such *contagious disease*.

I. The Eunuch and Androgine, are not fit subiects of Marriage: therefore wee cannot separate them, but only declare that they were neuer conioyned: As when wee breake an oath, made of a thing vnpossible, or vnlawfull, wee doe not dispence with the former bond of the oath: but onely we shew that the matter of

this

this oath is defectiue and so makes a nullitie: Concerning a Disease, if it were before wedlocke, and concealed by fraud, we answere as before: But, if it follow Marriage, then absolute seperation may not be granted: For God that inflicted the tentation, will giue the issue therewith; that is either healing or patience, with the gift of chastitie.

N. But *death* may lawfully be inflicted; and so the *married couple* lawfully separated.

I. What is lawfully performed by the Magistrate is done as by God himselfe, who may not be confined within Lawes: Againe the Magistrates intent is of himselfe, onely to make a diuorce betweene bodie and soule and so the seperation of the married parties doth only follow by accident. Lastly, the malefactor dying, ceaseth to be a subiect capable of Marriage; and therefore of diuorce or separation. For (if wee will not speake improperly) separation cannot be betweene things, which, being separated, doe not retaine there being; As for example, If it be true which some thinke that the soules of bruit beasts, bee accidents, and annihilated by death, then the tearme of death doth equiuocally agree to man and beasts, considering that in the one there is a proper separation, but not in the other.

Subiectiue in anima. Organice & Obiectiue in Corpore.

N. The *Cause* borrowed from the *soule*, is *Infidelitie* or *Adulterie*. Touching the first, you disanull not *Marriages*, made betweene *Papist*, and *Protestant*.

I.

I. But some of your friends at Amsterdam, doe allow Pollygamie in their Proselytes: which if they did returne home, would bee found by our Lawes to bee little lesse then Felons.

N. Certaine it is that you breake Saint [b] *Pauls* rule.

b 1.*Cor.*7.15.

I. It is more certaine that your fellowes, vnderstand not Saint [c] Paul: For first it is plaine by that which goeth before, that the Separation must be passiue in regard of the beleeuer, not actiue; that is, the beleeuer may marrie after desertion, but may not forsake the vnbeleeuer: Secondly, reconciliation must be vehemently sought, before the second Marriage bee attempted: Thirdly, it must bee considered, that a Papist is not an Infidell, but a Christian as was declared in your first generall obiection:) Fourthly, this Apostolique Canon, is not in force with vs, because our Prince, being a Christian, both can and doth inforce by Law, the person departing to return; whereas this rule was only then effectuall whilest Princes were vnbeleeuers.

c 1.*Cor.*7.12.

*Lib.*1.*c.*1.*p.*5.

N. Yea, but *adulterie* is an *absolute cause of seperation*: and yet you *enforce* the *innocent partie* to remaine *vnmarried*.

I. We iudge the second Marriage of the innocent partie (during the life of the partie nocent) not to bee absolutely vnlawfull; but yet very vnexpedient: First, because it is fit hee should

should something feele the smart of his owne bad election (if any such were:) Secondly, if that were not, it is not to be doubted but God, if hee be importuned by Prayer, will giue the gift of chastitie, considering the temptation is occasioned by a cause extrinsicall: Thirdly, there bee sundrie cases; wherein the partie nocent may be receiued againe after diuorce: As first in case the woman were rauished: Secondly, if shee erred in the person of her husband: Thirdly, if she married vpon his long absence; and report of his death: Fourthly, if hee be a Pandar to his owne wife: Fiftly, if after the first offence hee haue pardoned her, and she hath offended no more: Sixtly, if she may plead Compensation, namely, that he offended, aswell as her selfe: Seuenthly if he haue denied her due beneuo'ence: In all which cases it is necessarie to receiue her home. But in case shee doe shew the outward signes of repentance, it is expedient also to admit her againe; because wee are moued thereunto not only by the example of the good [d] Leuite (who peraduenture did erre in that matter) but euen of Christ himselfe, who hath oftentimes beene reconciled to the Church his Spouse, after her manifold and manifest idolatrous adulteries: Fourthly, because her by is hindered the readines both to accuse, and offend, whereas otherwise the flames of malice and lust, would bring an vniuersall combustion: Fiftly; be-

Apprimè si primum tempus.

[d] *Iudges 9.3.*

because hereby is auoided the confusion of Families; the neglect of the education of Children; with many other mischiefes, which were more lamentable to indure, then easie to recount; or, otherwise then thus, to preuent.

N. From the *bond* of *Marriage* I proceed to the *honour* thereof: wherein wee dislike both *your contradiction*; and *your errours*: First, then though you grant *Marriage* to be *honourable*; yet you *seruillifie* the *husband*; causing him to say to his *wife*, *with my bodie I thee worship*.

Εξουσιάζει. 1. Cor. 7. 4.

I. The plaine interpretation of these words may be fetcht from Saint Paul's Canon (The man hath not power of his owne bodie, but the woman, &c.) The Greeke word doth signifie to haue priuiledge, propertie, libertie, or authority (as appeares by the word, from which this is deriued:) which differeth little from worship: For what greater ciuill [d] worship or dignitie can there be, then for a man to surrender to his wife the propertie of his bodie? And tell mee (I pray you:) were the words thus deliuered in Latine, Corpore te meo dignor; seu dignum censeo; what great Idolatrie or Seruillitie should be in them?

d Εξουσίαν. *Iohn* 1. 12. From which worship is deriued.

N. To leaue your *Contradiction*; I haste to your *errours*, which are two: First, in the *Authour* you cite: Secondly, in the *degrees of honour* which you ascribe to *Marriage*. Touching the first when you alleadge a place of the *Epistle* to the [e] *Hebrewes*, you definitiuely auouch

e *Heb.* 13. 4.

Saint

Saint *Paul* to bee the Authour thereof.

I. Are you offended that wee call the Apostle Saint? Doe you now doubt of his Saintship?

N. Nothing lesse: But wee maruell that you call not *Abraham*, *Iob*, and *Moses* Saints, aswell as *Paul* and *Peter*.

I. Wee maruell that you call not Paul and Peter Masters, aswell as Luther and Bucer.

N. Not because they were lesse worthy of this title; but because the *phrase* of *those times* and *countries* was different from *ours*.

I. The like may be said of the terme Saint; which was not taken vp, till the Primitiue Church (which began after Christ) did much vse it for the dignifying of the Apostles and Martyrs, which were Lights, not of a Church confined within Palestina: but extended as farre as the line of Heauen.

N. But wee are more displeased that you thus confidently auouch, that of Saint *Paul*, which scarce amounteth to the credit of an *Ecclesiasticall Tradition*.

I. Although the Tradition of Antiquitie bee most venerable with vs, yet besides it, wee haue other proofe that Saint Paul was [f] Authour of this Epistle: For Saint Peter, writing his Second Epistle to the Dispersed Hebrewes, thus speaketh to them, as our brother [g] *Paul* wrote vnto you.

N. He wrote that in his *Epistle* to the [h] *Romans*:

f 1.*Pet.*1.1. 2.*Pet.*3.1.

g 2.*Pet.*3.15.

h *Rom.*2.4.

mans : For it appeares in the same Chapter: that hee directeth much of his speech to the *Iewes*, which (as it seemeth) were then at *Rome*.

i *Heb* 10 22. & 32. *ad finem.*

I That place is alledged, out of the Epistle to the i Hebrewes: where that argument is copiously handled. As for the place by you quoted it is impertinent: For, if you make a iust Analysis of the second Chapter to the Romans, you shall finde that the Apostles speech (directed to the Iewes by the way of a Prosopopeia) beginneth not till the seuenteenth Verse; whereas the words by you cited are in the fourth: For whereas you imagine that hee writ to the Iewes that were at Rome, you must remember; First, that Saint Paul had not as yet beene at k Rome: Secondly, that when hee came thether, the chiefe of the Iewes told him, that they had heard of l no letter concerning him, which could not be, if his Epistle had beene in part directed to them.

k *Rom.* 1 15.

l *Acts* 28. 21.

N. But the *Apostle* doth not prefixe his name before the *Epistle* to the *Hebrewes*.

I. He might forbeare that, because his name was scandalized among the Iewes. Will you denie that Moses was authour of Genesis and Exodus? Or Ezra of the Chronicles, and Ester, because their names are not set before those Bookes?

N. But *this stile* differeth from *the other Epistles* of *Paul*.

I. I might tell you, how some coniecture, that

that Paul wrote it in Syrian: and that Clemens or Luke, translated it into Greeke. To let this passe; If Moses were the Authour of Iob, How doth the stile differ from that in Deuteronomy? If this bee but probable, how doth the stile of the Canticles differ from that of the Prouerbs? Will any man reading the two Epistles of Peter, denie a diuersitie of stile?

N. But the *Authour* excludeth himselfe from the number of them which had [m] heard Christ.

m *Heb.*2.3.

I. Hee had not heard him, when hee was aliue vpon the earth: Againe, he speaketh by a [n] Figure numbring himselfe among the multitude, as also doth Saint [o] Peter.

n A figure called ἀναπλήρωσις

o 1.*Pet.*4.3.

N. Your *errour* in the *honour* which you ascribe to *Marriage* is double: For you make it both an *holy thing*, and a *Sacrament*. The former appeareth, First, by this, that *you aske the Banes in the Church*: whereas *Marriage* belongeth to the *Magistrate*.

I. The Couenant of God may bee published by the Priest: But such is [p] Marriage: and therefore may by the Priest be promulgated.

p *Prou.*2.17.

N. How doe you explaine your *Minor*?

I. The Couenant which makes a wife, is here called God's Couenant: But such is [q] Marriage: Marriage therefore is Gods Couenant: Besides it is an Oath, or Vow made in Gods presence.

q *Mal.*2.14.

N. An *Oath* may be tendred before a *Magistrate*: And therefore *Marriage* in *this respect* may be but a *ciuill action*.

I. A Prayer may be repeated before a Magistrate; is it therefore ciuill?

N. Hee hath no *iurisdiction* in *Prayer*, as hee hath ouer an *Oath*.

I. Is not prayer, a good thing? May not hee command you to doe that which is good? Nay is not an oath, a kind of prayer? Againe I thus reason: Where publique prayer is expedient, that thing may be done in the Church. But such is in Marriage: And therefore in the Church it may bee celebrated: And by consequent the Banes asked, for the preuention of all fraud and couin. The Minor thus appeareth: As the action is, so must bee the prayer thereto belonging. But the action of Mariage is publike: and therefore such must bee the Prayer thereto appertaining when I say it must be, I meane, it is most expedient: I meane then, it must be vpon conueniencie: not vpon necessitie.

N. But *God* neuer commanded the *Hebrew Priests* to marrie the *people* at the *Tabernacle*, or *Temple*.

I. It had been something laborious, to haue brought all the people to bee married at the Temple of Ierusalem. Neuerthelesse the Iewish Rabbins tell vs that Marriage was celebrated in a Tent, set vpon foure barres, ouer against the Synagogue: to which Tent, [s] Dauid, [t] Ioel, and [u] Christ himselfe to allude: and therefore it seemeth that the Priest did something intermeddle with these matters; whereupon both Pagans, Turkes, and Christians, all with one consent (in all Ages, Countries and Sects) haue

r *Rabbi Mose Ban Maimone in Cu: pa.*
s *Psal.* 19. 5.
t *Ioel* 2. 16.
u *Math.* 25. 1. *Luke* 12. 36.

reputed Marriage as a ſacred thing: and haue ſolemnized it with ſundrie Ceremonies.

N. The *ſecond thing* whereby you imitate the *holineſſe of Marriage* is, that you cauſe *the parties to kneele before the Communion Table*: and withall *inſinuate* as though it were *fit* to haue a *Communion* annexed to *euery Marriage*.

I. I know not, what herein may offend you, but onely that this Law is not put in execution, as it were to be wiſhed for theſe cauſes; Firſt, That the parties might be put in minde of mingling ſpirituall with earthly ioy: Secondly, that they might bee aduertiſed, touching the end of Matrimony, which is the enlarging of the number of the Saints, whoſe Communion is moſt lively repreſented in the Lord's Supper: Thirdly, that they might bee effectually warned to remember the vnion of Chriſt, and the Church (his Spouſe,) which is moſt plainly exhibited in the Sacrament.

N. By this *laſt clauſe* you declare that you make *Matrimonie* a *Sacrament*.

I. If that were true, to what end ſhould we ioine another Sacrament to it?

N. I will proue that you make *Wedlocke* a *Sacrament*; both by the *cauſes* and by the *ſigne*: The *cauſes* are the *finall*, and *formall*. The *finall* is ſet downe in theſe words of *one* of your *Prayers*: *which haſt conſecrated it to ſuch a myſterie*.

I. What will you proue hereby?

N. *Two things*; Firſt, that by theſe words,

you

you create a new *Sacrament*: Secondly, that the *words* be *erroneous*: Touching the *first*, I thus reason; *That thing which is consecrated to such an excellent mysterie, that in it is signified and represented the spirituall Marriage and Vnitie betweene Christ and his Church; That thing is a Sacrament. But such is the state of Matrimonie in your opinion: amongst the Sacraments therefore to be reckoned.*

I. Your Maior is mistaken, in regard of the Consequence thereof: For a thing may be consecrated to a mysterie, either to apply it, or to signifie it. The former way both Water in Baptisme, as also Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper are sanctified: For they doe apply, and conuay vnto vs, the Spirit of God: and consequently both Christ and his Father; namely, by the Vnion of Assistance. In the latter sence, Marriage is consecrated only to signifie the spirituall vnitie, or vnion betweene Christ and his Church: And this is the true cause, why Matrimonie is no Sacrament, as Baptisme, and the Lord's Supper.

N. That the *words* be *erroneous* I thus proue; *That which was before the mysterie, could not be consecrated to signifie the same: But Marriage was before the mysterie of this vnion: And therefore could not be so consecrated.*

I. The Maior is like the verses of Dionysius, which could not be corrected, but by blotting of them all out: Let your Maior be thus inuerted; A thing must bee, before it signifie: and

then

then it will bee true. Were there not Lambes before the Passeouer? Water before Baptisme? Bread and Wine before the Lord's Supper? Againe, your Minor is vntrue: For the Second Person in Trinitie was the Mediatour of the Church before the fall of man; and consequently by order of nature though not of time) was before Matrimonie. I meane as it was a cause, not as it was a thing signed: For Relatiues are together in nature.

N. That which doth only signifie *parabolically, that cannot bee consecrated to signifie a mysterie* (vnlesse wee will imagine that euery *Vine* with the *Branches*; and *Head* with the *Members*, are so *consecrated* because they are so *resembled* by x *Christ*, and the y *Apostle*.) *But Marriage doth only parabolically, signifie this* z *mysterie. Therefore we may not say that it is consecrated.*

x *John* 15.1.
y 1 *Cor.* 12.11.
z *Ephes.* 5.32.

I. It seemeth by Saint Paul, that he maketh more then a Parable thereof: As before him both a Dauid and b Salomon; yea and c Ezekiel had done. So that it seemeth Matrimonie was consecrated by these Diuine Pens to the opening of this mysterie.

a *Psal.* 45 *totum*
b In the *Canticles.*
c *Ezek* 16. *totum.*

N. But doe you find no other *consecration* of *Matrimonie* then this?

I. Wee doubt not to say with Antiquitie that Euah being taken out of the side of sleeping Adam, was a figure of the Church proceeding from the vertuous side of the Second Adam, sleeping in Death. God therefore deliuering

uering Euah to the Man, did consecrate Marriage to represent this Mysterie.

N. From the *end* I passe to the *forme*, which in these words is set downe: *I pronounce that they be man and wife together, In the name of the Father; of the Sonne: and of the Holy Ghost, Amen:*) which differs little from the *forme* of *Baptisme*.

I. What call you the forme of Baptisme properly?

N. These words *I Baptize thee in the name of the Father*, &c.

I. What Scripture haue you for this opinion?

d *Math.* 28. 19. *N.* Is it not written, d *Goe teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father*, &c?

I. But doth Christ command vs to vse these verie words: In the name of the Father, &c?

N. So all thinke but *Papists*, who say, That this forme doth depend vpon the vertue of *Tradition*.

I. The plea of Tradition is here impertinent. For tell me is not Baptisme a Sacrament? Is not a Sacrament an Action? Can the forme of an action be words? Againe, is the forme in those words; I Baptize? Or in these; In the name of the Father? To auouch the former is vaine: For can the forme of Baptisme bee to Baptize? The latter is as vntrue: For by the Name of the Father, &c. is meant the Authoritie of the Trinitie. By which is rather intimated an efficient cause, then a forme of Baptisme.

N.

M. Doe not we generally say, that the *Arrians* erre in the *forme* of *Baptisme*, because they vse thus to baptize *Infants*: *In the name of God the Father: and of the Sonne a Creature*: And of *the holy Ghost a Creature, I baptize thee?*

I. What thinke you of him that baptized an Infant, In nomine Patria, Filia, & Spirita Sancta? Did hee erre in the forme of Baptisme?

N. No doubt his *errour* was in the *forme* of the *words* (his *Latine* being not *congruous*) yet the *Baptisme* was no *nullitie*: neither might be *iterated*, because the *substance* and *forme* were still retained.

I. You see then that this phrase is but meerely popular: So that by forme is only meant forme of words: that is, a forme representiue, not reall: For it is neither inward, nor outward; Not inward, For, that is the vnion of Christ's bloud with vs; Not Outward; For that must be Visible, not Audible: a Deed, not a Word: But were all this granted; will you make euery thing a Sacrament wher in these words are vsed, In the name of the Father, &c? If Paul instead of these words, I [e] command thee in the name of Iesus to goe out of her, had said, I *command thee in the name of the Trinitie*, had he spoken any thing vnfit or vntrue?

[e] *Acts* 16.18.

N. Nothing lesse, except wee thinke: that those which were *baptized* in the *Name* of *Iesus Christ*, were not baptized in the *Name* of the [f]

[f] *Acts* 19.5.

Trinitie, which to maintaine were little lesse then *Heresie*.

I. What then? Did Saint Paul make dispossession of Deuils, a Sacrament, because hee vsed words equipollent to these In the name of the Father?

N. He did only declare by what *authoritie* he cast out *the euill spirit*.

I. So when we say in Matrimonie, (In the the name of the Father) we only shew in what Name, and by what Authoritie we pronounce them to be man and wife, namely in the Name of that God, who conioyned the first couple, in the Paradise of Pleasure.

N. As the *cause* to the *signe* (namely, the *Ring*) shewes *Marriage* to be a *Sacrament*: which being a *meere humane inuention* is to be exploded out of the *Church*.

g *Gen.* 24. 22. & 30.

I. What thinke you of the Eare-rings, which Abrahams seruant gaue to Rebecca?

N. Hee thought shee should be *wife* to *Isaake*, and therefore presented her with these *symbols* of *nuptiall amitie*. But what? Can this warrant the prophaning of the *Church* with a *Ciuill Ring*?

h *Rom.* 16. 16.

I. What conceiue you of the h holy kisse, conioyned by the Apostle?

N. It was a *signe* of *spirituall amitie*: and therefore vsed in the *Church*.

I. But was the signe also spirituall?

N. It was indeed drawne from a *ciuill custome*

of

of the *East*, yet amplified and conuerted, to bee an *argument* of *ſpirituall coniunction*.

I. **But yet it was commanded by the** Apoſtle: **why is it not ſtill practized in the** Church?

N. It was not iudged ſo decent by reaſon of the *contrarie auſtome* in ſome parts of *Europe*.

I. **By this you may vnderſtand, that the thing was but** indifferent **and** mutable: **and yet for a time entoyned by** Apoſtolique, **and** Eccleſiaſticall Authoritie: **as were alſo the** [i] Loue Feaſts; **and likewiſe** abſtaining from things ſtrangled, and from bloud. **From which** laſt inſtance **we thus argue;** Abſtinencie from things ſtrangled, and from bloud, were for a time neceſſarie by reaſon of the Churches iniunction: And yet the ſame things were then but indifferent, and changeable (**as all men doe confeſſe**) Some things indifferent therefore may by the Church bee impoſed as neceſſarie; **I meane in regard of the** externall order; **not of** eternall life.

i *Acts* 15.20. 28,29.

N. Yea, but the *Ring* is not a *thing indifferent*, being laden with ſo many *myſticall ſignifications*.

I. **That is** myſticall **which exceedeth** naturall capacitie: **But the** ſignifications **of the** Ring **are ſuch as all men by the light of nature, may obuiouſly vnderſtand; as namely, that the** gold **doth ſignifie the** price **and** puritie; **the** roundneſſe, **the** perpetuitie; **the** poeſie, **the** perſpicuitie

ſpicuitie of loue: the putting thereof vpon the fourth finger of the left hand, doth repreſent that it is heartie; becauſe to that finger there comes an arterie from the heart. Theſe ſignifications cannot properly be tearmed myſticall. The like is to be ſaid of the ioyning of hands. Beſides doe you imagine, that as many myſticall ſenſes might not be framed of the holy kiſſe? and yet that was no cauſe why it ſhould be banished out of the Church.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of Churching: and Buriall.

N. *Conſequent* of *Matrimonie* (as you pretend) is the *Churching* and *Purification* of *Women*: Againſt the which I thus reaſon; *Purification is a thing Iewiſh: And therefore to be abrogated.*

I. If your Antecedent be allayed with a limitation, it will agree with the conſequent, like clay with iron. *Publique Prayer* as it was Iewiſh, and reſpected the Temple of Salomon doth now vtterly ceaſe: Shall we thereupon conclude, that all Publique Prayer is to be prohibited? In like manner wee ſay, that Iewiſh Purification is indeed to be abrogated, ſo farre forth

forth as it is Iewish: But that is impertinent to our Churching.

N. The end of Purification is abrogated (which was the [k] *Presentation* of the *Childe* to [l] *God:*) *And therefore the thing it selfe is also disanulled.*

I. That was not the only end thereof: For in case the Childe died; yet the Mother was to be purified: And therefore that place in Luke doth admit a double reading; either the purification of her [m] or of [n] them (that is, of the Mother, and the Childe:) There was an other end more peculiar to the Mother.

N. That is, *sacrificing*, as appeares [o] by.

I. But what dutie by that sacrifice was intimated?

N. *Two principall duties* were insinuated: First, the *acknowledgement* of *her sinne*: For which cause, besides the *great Purification* (which was performed in *her owne separation* seuen dayes if it were a *Male*; and in the *Circumcision* of the *Childe*, vpon the *eight day*: but in case it were a *female* in *separation* for fourteene dayes) she had also the *lesse purification*: which endured thirtie three dayes if it were a *sonne*, and sixtie six if a *daughter*: whereby was signified, First, that the the *sinne* of *Euah* was [p] *double* to that of *Adam*: For *he* sinned alone; *shee* deceiued him also: Secondly, that shee deriued sinne from *her selfe* to her *children*: For this cause also shee offered a *sinne offering*: Secondly, as for the *whole burnt Offering* it was *Eucharisticall*, namely, a *thankes-*

giuing

k For now Infants are presented in Baptisme: So they were in Circumcision.

l *Luke* 2.22.

m αὐτῆς.

n αὐτῶν.

o *Leuit.*12.6.

p A double Sinne: a double purification and repentance.

giuing for her safe deliuerance.

I. It is manifest then, though sacrifice bee abolisht; yet confession of sinnes, and thankesgiuings for benefits doe remaine.

N. That these things remaine we denie not: But why should they be *publique*? By the same reason euery man that hath escaped shipwracke, warre, or fire should present his *publike thankes* in the *Church*.

I. If it were so, were the pot broken, or the water spilt? Did not the [q] Prophet so in the [q] Psalme? In publike benefits wee solemnize publike thankesgiuings: Now, the benefit of deliuerance from the paines of child-birth is, in a manner, publique: Forasmuch as these dolours were inflicted vpon the whole [r] female sexe?

q Ps. 116. 13, 14

r Gen. 3. 16.

N. The *Iudaisme* of your *purification* appeares: First, in that you bring in *the vaile*, which is a *ragge* of *Superstition*.

I. What thinke you of Rebeccaes vaile, which she put on in the presence of [s] Isaac?

s Gen. 24. 65.

N. It was a *modell* of her *modestie*: but what is that to the *vaile* in the *Church*?

I. Not only that modestie, but euen that vaile is required by Saint Paul in the [t] Congregation.

t 1 Cor. 11. 10.

N. It is imposed vpon *all women*; not vpon *them alone* which come to be *Churched*.

I. Can you indure Saint Paul making it a perpetuall ordinance; and yet not tolerate it in vs,

vs, which doe not so much command it to bee vsed, as shew what is decent? Certainly if it be at all times comely, then especially at that time, when women being guiltie of their owne infirmities, should shew the greatest symbols of shamefastnesse in Publique Assemblies; From which for a time (by necessitie of corrupted nature) they haue beene separated.

N. The *second argument* of your *Iudaisme* is the *offering* imposed vpon *Women*.

I. Doe you dislike the thing or the name?

N. Wee doe not so much insist vpon the *thing* (as being pretended to bee a *dutie*, or *due* to the *Minister*) but the tearme *Offering*, as *Iewish*.

I. Tithes were Offerings [u] to God: But Tithes were duties due to the [x] Priests (as being the recompence for their seruice:) Therefore the duties of the Priest, are indeed, and may be called Offerings.

u *Numb.* 18.24.
x *Numb.* 18.31.

N. In this *reason* I obserue *two things*: First, that you make *things due to the Minister* to bee *Wages* or *Stipends*; whereas some of your *fellowes* thinke *Stipends* as bad as *Almes*.

I. Stipends from the wauering multitude without Charter or Patent, differ not in nature from Almes: But Honourable Stipends, set downe by the Lawes of God and the Prince, we disallow not. For as the stipend of a Souldier is giuen by the Prince, though it be deducted from the tribute imposed vpon the People:

So

So the riches of the Priests are God's stipends, though first consecrated to God by the people his tributaries.

N. If a man hire *workmen* to make a *bridge* for the *benefit* of the *Countrie*; shall wee not say that he giueth a *great Almes*?

I. No doubt hee doth to the Countrey, but not to the labourers: vnlesse they take their hire, and worke not: And yet (euen then) are they not almesmen, but theeues; and are compellable both to make restitution, and to suffer punishment. In like manner, he that erecteth a Church; and giueth maintenance to a Priest doth indeed a singular almes to the people, but none to the Priest vnlesse hee bee vnfaithfull, and yet (euen then) he is not an almesman but a robber; and stands answerable to his superiours vnder God.

N. If *all* the *people* then giue *tithes*, doe they giue *almes* to themselues?

I. They giue their homage to God; and to the Minister they performe an action of Iustice, not of liberalitie: If any almes be, it is to themselues: For example; If the maker of the Bridge (of which we spake) doe thereby reape to his owne person some maine benefit (as the preseruation of his life, and the like) may not hee bee said in a sort to haue giuen himselfe an almes?

N. The second thing, remarkeable in your reason is, that you seem to maintain *Iewish Tithes*.

I.

I. Tithes we defend, but not as Iewish. For whereas among ỹ Iewes there were fiue kinds of Tithes; First, Prediall (or great Tithes) due to the Priests and [a] Leuits: Secondly, Personall (called the offerings of the [b] hands) due to the same likewise: Thirdly, the Tithe of Tithes due to the High [c] Priest: Fourthly, the Anniuersarie [d] Tithes, which were spent in the Voyage to and from the Tabernacle; in which the Leuite had also a part: Fiftly, the [e] Three yeares Tithes, whereof part likewise came to the Leuite: we hold that prediall and personall tithes, are due to Ministers: The tithe of tithes partly to the Prince, partly to the Bishops: The yearely, and three yeare tithes, partly to the reparations of Churches, Schooles, and Colledges: (yea, and if need were, for their erection:) partly for the maintenance of the Ministers themselues (where their ordinary tithes are not found competent) and of the poore.

a *Leuit.*27.30. *Numb.*18.24.
b *Deut.*12.6.
c *Numb.*18.26.
d *Deut.*14.22.
e *Deut.*14.28.

N. To let passe your *fancies*; proue *in generall*, *tithes* to be due to the *Ministers* of the Gospell; and not to the *Priests of* Aaron's *order only*.

I. Tithes were due to [f] Melchisedech, who was no Priest according to the order of Aaron: and therefore not due to the Leuiticall Priests only.

f *Gen.*14.20. *Heb.*7.4.

N. Abraham indeed paid *tithes*; yet not of *all his goods*; but of *all the spoiles*, as the *Author* to the *Hebrewes* doth [g] expound it.

g τῶν ἀκροθινίων.

I. Tithes must bee paid of a mans owne: But the ſpoiles were not Abraham's (as appeares by his oath in h the Storie.) Tithes therefore were not paid of the ſpoiles. As for the Ezecke word you alleadge, it may be tranſlated of the beſt or chiefe things. Againe, if wee retaine the word ſpoiles; it will bee proued thereby that perſonall tithes of the gettings of mens hands are due, conſidering that ſpoiles, obtained in a lawfull warre, are of that nature. My ſecond argument for tithes is this: That which God giueth to the *Prieſt*, being receiued from the people, ſeemeth to be naturall and eternall; foraſmuch as no man may reuoke it: But ſuch are i tithes: They are therefore irreuocable.

h *Gen.*14.22,23.

i *Leuit.*27.30. *Numb.*18.24.

N. They are ſo from the *Iewiſh Prieſts*: what is that to our *Miniſters?*

I. That will appeare, by this my third argument: The Labourers wages are due to the k Miniſters of the Goſpell: But ſuch are l tithes: They are therefore due to our Euangelicall Miniſters.

k 1.*Tim.*5.18.
l *Numb.*18.31.

N. *Tithes* were due for the *ſeruice* at the *Altar*, which now ceaſeth.

I. Doth not the Apoſtle ſay, that the ſame ſeruice in ſubſtance m remaineth: Doe not our Miniſters as well teach the People, and pray for them, as the Prieſts of the Law? My fourth reaſon is thus framed: The Prophets vſe to exhort men to Morall, not to Ceremoniall duties:

m 1.*Cor.*9 13. *Heb.*13.10.

But

But *Malachie* doth exhort men to pay [n] tiches: They be therefore Morall.

N. I would haue some *argument* drawne from the *new Testament*.

I. You haue heard in part before: But now I directly proceed further to my first argument: Tithes are counted matters of the Law (and such as may not be left vndone) by [o] Christ himselfe: And therefore they are to be paid.

N. They are counted as *small matters*.

I. Yea, but he that breaketh the least Commandement, and teacheth men so to do (as many seditious men, which teach the People to giue the Hundreth, for the Tithe) shall be the least in the Kingdome of [p] heauen.

N. Yea, but *this place* proueth onely that they should be paid to the *Priests* of the *Law*.

I. The contrarie appeareth by my sixt reason: Things consecrated and giuen to the Ministers of the Gospell, may not bee reuoked; (as appeareth by the Storie of [q] Ananias:) But Tithes haue beene giuen to the Church by our Ancestors euen before the times of *Poperie*. And therefore may not be recalled.

N. Your *Maior* is not firme: For *Ezekias* pluckt off the *Plates* (which himselfe had *consecrated*) from *the Temple* [r] *dores*.

I. Ezekias did therein most grieuously sin: and thereupon it may bee thought that God turned the heart of Zenacherib to breake his Couenant with the King, and to bring vpon him

n *Mal.*3.10.

o *Mat.*23.23.

p *Math.*5.19.

q *Acts* 5.3.

r 2.*Kings* 18.16.

him the dreadfull warre, which without God's immediate aide, had beene irresistible. Now if if iudgement begin at Gods house, where shall the sinners [f] appeare?

[f] 1. Pet. 4. 17.

N. But put the case, our *Forefathers* had neuer dedicated *Tithes* to the *Church*; how had they beene *then due* to the same?

I. My seuenth Argument will declare it: He that is catechized, Let him make him that catechizeth him, partaker of all his [t] goods. This cannot bee done without Tithes; as may appeare by the Storyes of Abraham and [u] Iacob.

[t] Gal. 6. 6.

[u] Gen. 14. 20. & 28. 22.

N. It may bee done by *Competencie*, without *Tithes*.

I. As God set the seuenth Day for the Sabbath; So hee ordained the tenth for Maintenance, We dare not iudge his proportions lesse wise then those which are forged by the braines of men. My eight and last reason is drawne from analogie and proportion: That which was giuen to the Seruitours of the Law, ought much more to be granted to the Ministers of the [x] Gospell: But the Legall Priests had more then Tithes: (For we know they had the first fruits; the redemption of the first borne; 48. Cities with land about them; sundry parts of the Sacrifices, &c.) The Ministers of the Gospell therefore ought to haue tithes at the least.

[x] Luk. 7. 28. 1. Cor. 9. 13. 2. Cor. 3. 9.

N. *Tithes* were *Ceremoniall*; and therefore to be *abolished*.

I. In regard of the particular assignation to the Tabernacle they were indeed rituall: but as they were stipends of Gods publike seruice; so they both were, and are naturally Morall.

N. The *Tithes* might bee *y redeemed*; and therefore *not necessarie*.

y *Leuit.* 27.32.

I. They could not be redeemed, vnlesse the fift part were added: whereby their necessitie doth much more appeare: as also for that they could not be z changed without a Curse.

z *Leuit.* 27.33.

N. They that were in Cities paid no tithes: And therefore they are not necessarie.

I. First, this argument might proue Tithes vnder the Law of Moses, to haue beene needlesse, which had beene an emptie proofe: Secondly, a Prediall Tithes were due euen in b Cities; considering that in Cities also Cattle may be found: Thirdly, instead of those tithes, they had sundrie other recompences: which were before named in my eight Argument: Fourthly, the fruit of the ground may bee expounded of the rates of houses: which being tithed will exempt all scruple: Fiftly, some imagine that Countrie tithes were diuided among the Leuites dwelling whersoeuer: but this is vncertaine.

a Personall tithes were there also due.

b As is plaine in the Cities of *Ninive, Babylon, Ierusalem*, and others.

N. The Apostles were maintained by c *almes, & not by tithes: And therefore tithes are not needfull.*

c 1. *Phil* 4.15.

I. That these contributions of the People were almes you cannot proue: forasmuch as they were due, as Saint d Paul declareth at large.

d 1. *Cor.* 9.6, 7. &c. *Gal.* 6.6. & 10.

large. By which places also we haue shewed tithes euen then also to haue been due. Againe, tell me: If a man had reasoned thus in the time of Malachie: Tithes were not paid when the Israelites wandred in the Wildernesse: Now therefore they are not due to the Priests in *Canaan*: what would you haue answered?

N. Wee would haue said *to reason from the fact to the right, is not reasonable*: Againe it was not *seasonable* to argue from the *seed-time* to the *harvest*: from the *night* of *want*, to the *Day* of *Plentie*: from the *Barren Desart* to the *fruitfull Palestina*.

I. So we answere: that whilst the winter of persecution was vpon the Church, Tithes could not be exacted: but now it is preposterous to vrge the same order in the summer of our abundance. Tithes therefore (as you perceiue) are needfull: and yet the same are offerings to God: So that the tearme, Offering, need not displease you in our Churching of women.

N. From the *Rites* belonging to the *liuing*, we come to the *Burial* of the *Dead*: wherein wee dislike the *Person*, *Manner*, and *Place*. Touching the *first*, we maruell that you make *Burial* a *Ministeriall Dutie*, seeing the *Law* prohibiteth the *Priests* to *defile themselues* by the [c] *Dead*.

c *Levit.* 21. 1.

I. You were lately displeased, because we vsed Purification, being Iewish: And now you would haue vs vse the Iewish manner of Burial:

riall: Wee like not this: that with the same breath you blow both hot and cold: Againe, tell (I pray you) what meane you by that defiled with the Dead.

N. It seemeth that g *lamentation* is thereby meant.

I. Where is then your Argument? The Priest may not lament for the Dead: He may not therefore be present at Burials, to comfort them that lament, with his deuout exhortations and prayers.

N. We reade not that the *Priests* did *burie any man*: and therefore to *make this their office*, is *against Scripture*.

I. It is not against, but besides Scripture were it as you pretend. But the truth is: we doe not appoint the Priest to burie (that act being in a manner meerely ciuill) but only to assist the Funerall, for the comfort and instruction of the liuing.

N. The *manner* of your *Burials* doth also displease vs: Forasmuch as you vse *sundrie Prayers* therein, which seeme to fauour the *Popish Purgatorie*.

I. The Dumbe Shewes of Other Churches, though wee condemne not: yet wee cannot suppose that they containe so much reuerence and deuotion as our custome doth. As for the Purgatorie you mention, it is a forgerie of your owne Iealousie, considering wee pray for nothing in the behalfe of the Dead, saue only that wee

f *Reclusis illud; hoc clausis Lebÿt.*

g *Leuit.* 21. 3, 4.

wee seeme to be in good hope of their ioyfull resurrection, of which matter wee treated in Baptisme.

N. Yea, but *Prayers*, being rehearsed at the *Grane*, haue some *smell of Superstition.*

I. were you as quicke-sented as the Vultures of Romulus, yet could no such sauour bee here felt, forasmuch as our Prayers being in the mother tongue, are discerned by the meanest auditor to containe nothing but matter of consolation and hope to the liuing.

N. Funerall Sermons are of the *same braune:* and therefore iustly abrogated in the *Reformed Churches.*

N. If those Sermons containe flatterie, or errour, wee may not defend them: But if they be replenished with hopefull and consolatorie doctrines, we doubt not to thinke them to bee of that nature of which was the famous lamentation of Dauid made for his King [h] and his friend; Or of which were those worthy Orations [i] Funerall, which deserue to bee written in Plates of gold, celebrated in all antiquitie. And certainly if a Word in Place [k] and [l] Time bee so precious; If wee bee commanded to preach in [m] Season: Can any Sermon be more seasonable, then when God's iudgements concurre with his word; when the sense of mortalitie doth kindle deuotion; and griefe quickneth Charitie. Thinke you that when the men of Iabesh fasted [n] seuen dayes at the buriall of Saul

h 2. *Sam.* 1. 17.

i The Funerall Orations of *Basill* and *Gregorie.*

k *Prou.* 25 11.

l *Prou* 15. 23.

m 2. *Tim* 4. 2.

n 1. *Sam.* 31. 13

Saul and his ſonnes; and when Mary wept at the Tombe of her °brother, a Sermon would haue beene vnſeaſonable? Suppoſe you that in all thoſe ſeuen dayes (before mentioned) prayers were not mingled with their faſting? As for the Reformed Churches, wee cenſure them not; neither may they condemne vs; Forasmuch as the Strangers amongſt vs, being men of their owne Countrie and Diſcipline, doe ſtill retaine Funerall Sermons.

o *Iohn* 11.31.

N. Wee are moſt offended with your *Place* of *Buriall*, which is the *Church* or *Church-yard*: wherein you ſeeme to place *great holineſſe*.

I. Wee doe in ſome Cities allow men to be buried in a field ſet apart for that purpoſe.

N. But euen that *field* is reputed *holy ground*.

I. And that moſt iuſtly: For did not Abraham refuſe to be buried among the p Hittites? Did he not there buy a field for buriall, whereupon the Place was called Hebron? Did not Iacob deſire to be buried with q Abraham? Ruth with r Naomi? The old man with the ſ man of Iuda? Did not the Phariſes purchaſe a field for t ſtrangers, called Acheldama, a field of u Bloud? Is it not probable, that the brethren of Ioſeph deſired to bee buried with him in x Shichem? Did not the men in the Primitiue Church, deſire to be buried neere the Martyrs? by whoſe Tombes afterwards in the Halcionian dayes of Peace, Oratories and Churches were built for the honour of Martyrdome,

p *Gen.*23.6. & 9.

q *Gen.*49.30.
r *Ruth* 1.17.
ſ 1.*King.*13.31

t *Matth.*27.7.

u *Acts* 1.19.

x *Acts* 7.16.

not for the worship of Martyrs? Are not the bodies of Saints departed still members of Christ? being united to their soules, not onely by the relative hope of the resurrection; but euen by the vnion of Christ's Spirit? And, by what more liuely signe can we testifie, or signifie this our beliefe, then by interring them in or neere some Church, where they may be reserued better then in the y Pyramides of Egypt, till the second comming of CHRIST.

y Where the Kings of *Egypt* were buried.

Finis Libri Primi.

THE

THE SECOND BOOKE.

Of the New Liturgie.

CHAP. I.

Of the Booke of TOBIT.

FRom the *Old* wee paſſe to your *New Liturgie*: wherein you haue both added the *Apocryphall Bookes* to the the *Canon*: And haue in ſundry ſorts deprаued the *Canonicall Text* it ſelfe.

1. The Apocryphal Bookes (as Hierome ſaith) the Church doth reade for example of life and inſtruction of man-

The Booke of the Articles of Religion. Article 6.

manners: But yet doth it not apply them to establish any Doctrine.

N. Against the *reading* of *these Bookes* I thus argue. *Whatsoeuer is read in the Church ought to be Canonicall Scripture: But these Bookes are Apocryphall, not of the Canon: Wee may not therefore be vrged to reade them in the Church.*

I. First, your conclusion strayeth from your reason like a bird from her nest. It should haue beene thus framed: They may not therefore be read in the Church. You pretend as if you were vrged and inforced to reade them: the truth is if you did not delight in contention, as the Viper that was pleased with the bloud of her owne tongue, which shee grated against the file) you might easily perceiue that the Booke leaueth it to your discretion, whether you will read a Canonicall, or an Apocryphall Chapter.

N. If we may not reade them, then much lesse be we vrged to the reading of them. So that my *Conclusion* was a *Secondarie*, or *Corollarie*, naturally following out of the *proper conclusion* of *mine argument.*

I. In the meane time you see, that your complaints (of vrging and hard vsage, being both causeles and respectles) doe deserue to exasperate the State against you: for many things, no doubt, had beene either altered or mitigated, had you not against the rule of Pythagoras) digged in the fire with a sword:

But

But now to refuſite your argument: First, I might denie your Maior, and render foure reaſons for it: First, the Epiſtle written from [a] Laodicea, was read in the Church; and yet it was out of the Canon (vnleſſe you thinke it was ſome Epiſtle of Saint Paul, which is loſt) ſome thing therefore not Canonicall may be read in the Church.

N. I thinke no *Canonicall Epiſtle* could bee loſt: For it were to derogate too much from *Gods prouidence*, and the *faithfulneſſe* of the *Church*, which ſhould bee the *Keepreſſe* of the *Volumes* of the *Couenant*; I rather ſuppoſe that it was ſome *Epiſtle* written from the *Laodiceans* to *Paul*; to the *demands* whereof this *Epiſtle* to the *Coloſſians* did anſwere: And therefore that it might more plainly be vnderſtood, it was meete that the other of the *Laodiceans* ſhould bee read in the *Church* alſo: For ſuch a like thing is probably collected to haue beene done by the [b] *Corinthians*.

I. To lift the ground of your aſſertion were now vnſeaſonable: But you haue giuen in a faire euidence againſt your owne Maior, as ſhall hereafter appeare. My ſecond reaſon is this. Nine Chapters of the Booke of Iob: (whereof foure were vttered by [c] Eliphaz: three by [d] Bildad: two by [e] Zophar) are read in the Church: But theſe Chapters are not of the Canon (ſeeing no doctrine can be eſtabliſht by them foraſmuch as God himſelfe diſallowed the

a *Coll.* 4 16.

b 1. *Cor.* 7 1.

c *Iob* 4. & 5. & 15. & 22.
d *Chap.* 8. & 18. & 25.
e *Chap.* 11. & 20.

the [t] saying of Iobs three friends:) wee may therefore in the Church reade some thing which is not of the Canon.

t *Iob* 42.7.

N. *The generall positions* of *Iobs friends* are true: howsoeuer they erred in the *application* of them to *Iob* himselfe, as if *hee* had beene an *hypocrite*.

I. That is but a shift: for the maine maxime of all the Disputc, is taken from Iob's wiues [g] speech: The summe whereof may thus bee demonstrated: He that fals into great miseries is an hypocrite: But *Iob* is so falne: He is therefore an hypocrite. So then let him not continue in defending his vprightnesse but blesse [h] God in the acknowledgement of his hypocrisie and so let him die with repentance and patience. By this it is plaine: that the Maior Proposition was false, and not the Assumption onely as you pretend.

g *Iob* 2.9.

h *Ios.*7.19.

N. I hope you will not exclude *these nine Chapters* out of the *Canon*, considering they containe *an historicall*, though not *a positiue truth*: For it is true, that these men so spake, though they erred in their speech.

I. You haue made a faire distinction, whereby you will cut off your owne arguments made against the Apocryphall Bookes, as shall bee shewed in due place. My third argumẽt is this: Sundrie Bookes of Traditions were read in the Church of the Iewes; and yet were neuer of the Canon; Or else, how could the names

of

of Iannes & Iambres the i feare of Moses: the time of the famine in the dayes of k Elias: the combat of Michael with the l Deuill, & the prophesie of m Enoch haue bin rehearsed, as things vulgarly knowne: My fourth & last reason is this: Set Prayer may bee read in the Church (and yet is no part of the Canon) as was proued in the first o conference. Besides this, your Maior admits of a distinction, which is this: Whatsoeuer is read in the Church, must either bee the Canon of faith, or manners. To this latter kinde we may referre the Apocryphall Bookes.

i 2. Tim 3.8.
k Heb. 12. 21.
l Iames 5.17.
m Iude 9.
n Iude 14, 15.

o Lib. 1. chap. 2.

N. This is a *rotten deuice*: They cannot bee the *Canon* of *manners*: seeing that in the *Doctrine* of *manners* they may erre.

1. This answere shall bee sifted in your Minor. But now wee tell you further, that things may be read in the Church for the explanation of the Canonicall Scriptures. For (as you remember) you said the Epistle of the Laodiceans was read for the explanation of Saint Paul's Epistle to the Colossians.

N. But the *Bookes Apocryphall* doe rather *obscure*, then *explaine* the *Canon*.

1. The Booke of Wisdome doth open the Storie of Exodus concerning the ten p plagues of Egypt: Ecclesiasticus is a Commentarie to the Prouerbs: The Sixt of Baruch is a most famous epitome of sundrie things in Moses, the Psalmes, and the Prophets, against Idolatrie:

p See *Wisdome* 16. & 17.

The

q Especially to the 8. & 11. Chapters thereof.

The first Booke of Maccabees is a key to the mysteries q of Daniel.

N. Because you cauill so much at my *Maior*, I will change both *it*, and *my whole reason*: *Whatsoeuer is read in the Church, ought either to be Canonicall Scripture; or agreeable thereunto: But the Bookes betweene* Malachie *and* Matthew *are neither: And therefore may not be read.*

I. As the change of your Maior is to the better: so is that of your Minor to the worse; whereof wee desire the first part to bee explained; the latter to be confirmed.

N. That these Bookes are not *Canonicall*, it is plaine, because they are *Apocryphall*.

I. Some Serpent lurketh vnder this grasse: why call you them Apocryphall?

N. First, because they containe *sundrie errours.*

I. How many errours thinke you there be in the Booke of the Petition to the Parliament, defended by T. C?

N. Wee suppose no errour can bee found therein.

I. A Booke Apocryphall hath errours: But this Booke hath none, and therefore is not Apocryphall: and is by consequent, Canonicall.

N. It may be *Ecclesiasticall*; and so neither *Canonicall*, nor *Apocryphall*.

I. You see then that your reason is infirme. These Bookes are not Canonicall because A-

po-

poeryphall : and therefore Apocryphall [r] because they containe errours.

r *Non causa pro causa.*

N. Secondly, then, they are tearmed *Apocryphall*, because they are *capable* of *errours*, as being the *writings of men.*

I. This is to make them Apocryphall in possibilitie, not in act. Now euery possibilitie is reducible to some act. Tell then, what is the actuall cause, why they are Apocryphall.

N. Can a *priuation* haue an *actuall cause?*

I. The cause may be actuall; though rather deficient then efficient.

N. Thirdly, then; They are deemed *Apocryphall*, because their *Authour* is not knowne.

I. No more is the Authour of Ioshua, Iudges, Ruth, Samuel, Kings, no more of the Epistle to the Hebrewes (in your opinion.)

N. Their *Authour* is knowne to bee *Gods Spirit*, though we doubt of the *Penman.*

I. But how is that knowne?

N. The *Prophetical Church* receiued the Bookes as from God: and hath deliuered them to vs by *Succession:* Fourthly, then, these Bookes are *Apocryphall*, because the *Iewish Church* neuer receiued them: For neither were they written in any tongue which the *Iewes* vnderstood; neither doe the *Iewes* at this day admit of them, but as of *Interludes.*

I. You haue at the last stumbled vpon the true cause; but withall haue ouerwhelmed it with sundrie errours: The first is this: You

pretend them to bee refused by the Iewes; because they were written in a language not vnderstood by them: what? Did not Hierome out of Chaldie translate Tobit? Did not the Iewes in their Dispersion vnderstand the Greeke tongue, (namely in the Greekish Septuagint?) Why was the Epistle to the Hebrewes written in Greeke, if they were ignorant of the language? The like is to be said of the Epistles of Saint Iames and Saint Peter. Now tell me; Doe not you acknowledge our Apocryphall Bookes to haue beene written in Greeke? and yet was not Sirach's Sonne a Iew? Did not Philo, and Iosephus (being Iewes) write in Greeke? The second is rather a scoffe then an errour: Not vnlike that of some men, partly Arrians, and partly Barrowists, which call the Athanasian Creed, the Creed of Sathanasius. This is like that which is more then yea and nay; for it comes of euill. Your third errour is, that you acknowledge the traditionarie testimonie of the Church for the Bookes of Scripture: and yet explode all tradition, not only as needlesse, but euen as damnable. Your fourth errour is that you ascribe more to the Iewish Synagogue, then to the Christian Church; for you heard before out of Hierome that the Christians receiued these Bookes.

N. They receiued them but as *Apocryphall.*

I. And yet they read them in the Church.

N.

N. They were men and might erre: For wee are assured that *these Bookes* are not agreeable to the Canon, as containing and maintaining *manifold errours:* and therefore may bee the *Canon*, neither of *Faith*, nor of *Manners.*

I. **Wee denie that you can finde any errour in these Bookes concerning** Manners: **Now touching** Faith, fundamentall errours **wee acknowledge none in them. If any** petie fault or slip **be found our** subscription **is safe. But now bring forth the** errours **in their** numbers **and** armies.

N. The *Apocryphall Bookes*, are either such as are reputed so by the *Papists* themselues: (namely, the *third* and *fourth* of *Esdras:* and the *prayer of Manasses:* besides *some other Bookes*, not expressed in our *Common Bibles*;) or such as are so accounted of by the *Protestants onely*, whereof some *be not read*, some *be:* Of the *first kinde* are *certaine portions of Hester:* also *Susanna*, *Bell*, and the *Dragon:* and the two *Bookes* of the *Maccabees.* And here I maruell much, that the *first Booke* of *Maccabees* is not read in your *Church:* considering you say, it is a *key* to the *Mysteries* of *Daniel.*

I. **Euen for the same cause, that wee reade not other Bookes of the** Chronicles **and** Other Volumes **of** holy Scripture.

N. This *cause* shall hereafter be tried. Now the Bookes that you read are *Historicall*, or *Dogmaticall:* The *Historicall* be either *whole Bookes*, or

a *fragment*: Of the *first sort* are *Tobit* and *Iudith*: The Booke of *Tobit* containeth *errours* of *things to be beleeued*, or *to be done*: The *first sort* concerneth either *Angels*, or the *Meanes* of *our preseruation*: *Angels*, bee *good* or *euill*: In the *good* we may consider the *name*, and *nature*: concerning the *first*: The *Booke* setteth downe the *name* of an Angell, calling him[f] *Raphael*: whereas *Angels names* ought not to be enquired[t] after, as being [u]*secret*.

I. **The Bookes of** [x] Daniel, **of** [y] Luke, **of** [z] Iude, **and of** Saint[a] Iohn, **doe set downe the** names **of** Angels, **after which we should not enquire, because they be secret; are** they **therefore** Apocryphall?

N. These *names* are not *secret* to *God's Spirit*, which hath reuealed them to vs in these Bookes.

I. **And why may not** God's Spirit **reueale the name of** Raphael **in this Booke?**

N. This name *Raphael* is not extant in any other Booke of *Scripture*: and therefore it seemes to bea *tearme Apocryphall*.

I. **If a** Iew **should thus reason:** I finde the names *Gabriel* and *Michael*, specified no where but in *Daniel*: it seemes therefore the Booke should be Apocryphall: **what answere would you returne, if you were a** Iew, **and beleeued neither S.** Luke, **S.** Iude **nor Saint-**Iohn?

N. I would answer, It is sufficient that these names are recorded in *one Booke* of *Scripture*.

I. **So it is sufficient,** though Raphael **bee named**

f *Tobit.* 3. 17.
t *Gen.* 32. 29.
u *Iudg.* 3. 18.
x *Dan.* 19. 21. & 0. 21.
y *Luke* 1. 19.
z *Iud.* 9.
a *Apoc.* 12, 7.

named no where but in Tobit; vnlesse you beg the question: Besides the names of Angels are of two sorts: Some expressing their nature, some their office: Of this latter kinde is the name of [b] Seraphim, which signifies burning; because one of them touched the Prophets lips with a burning coale. To this head wee may referre Raphael, which signifieth one that healeth from God, because he healed Sara, and Tobit: Lastly, the place in Iudges, by you alleadged, is impertinent: The Angell which appeared might bee Christ, who said his name was Secret, or Wonderfull. The like Isaiah saith of [c] Christ: (hee shall call his name the Wonderfull, and so forth.) So that the Angell may seeme rather to haue reuealed his name to Manoah, then to haue [d] concealed it from him.

b *Isa* 6.2.

c *Isa*.9.6.

d God shewed the burning of *Sodom* to *Abraham*, and yet not to *Lot*: The time of death to *Ezekiah*: not to vs.

N. From the name of *Angels*, we come to their *nature*: wherein wee will trie *their number*, and *their office*: Touching the *first*; this Booke determineth that their are *seauen* [e] *Angels*, &c. which is partly *Magicall*, partly *Popish*: For first the *Magitians* (especially the *Iewes*) numbred *seuen Angels* according to the *seuen dayes of the weeke*: For *Sunday Raphael*, then *Gabriel*, *Sammael*, *Michael*, *Izidkiel*, *Hanael*, [f] *Repharie*l.

e *Tobit* 12.15.

f See *Iunius* vpon this place.

I. The Booke of Tobit doth not designe these Angels by dayes; much lesse reckoneth their names: though two of them (namely Gabriel, and Michael) are found elsewhere in Scrip-

Scripture: By what tradition the Iewes vnderstood the rest, we know no.: But, first we are sure the Angel tels Daniel that hee was one of the chiefe g Angels: Secondly, this number of seuen may probably be thus collected. The seuen eyes in h Zacharie, are by Saint Iohn expounded to bee the seuen spirits which are sent into all the i world: And what should be meant by these Spirits but Angels? Againe, Saint Iohn twice mentioneth seuen k Angels, it is not sufficient for you to exclaime that this is Magicall: Wee rather credit the Scriptures affirming, then your negatiue suppolals.

g *Dan.* 10.13.

h *Zach.*3.9.

i *Apoc.*5.6.

k *Apoc.*8.6. & 16.1.

N. The *seuen spirits* are expounded the Holy Ghost.

I. The exposition is but your owne.

N. Wha.? Doe you suppose that *Iohn* prayes for grace, and *peace* from *Angels?*

I. Not as from causes, but as from instruments: Againe, though they be interpreted of the Holy Ghost in the first Chapter: yet in the Vision of the fift Chapter, that exposition will be violent: For there it is said that the Lambe had seuen hornes, and seuen eyes; which are the seauen Spirits, sent out into all the World. Now it will be hard to make the Holy Ghost to be the hornes, and eyes of Christ the Lambe: Againe, how will you make the Holy Ghost to be sent out into all the World? what? are the wicked also partakers of him? But if you apply these phrases vnto Angels, they would most expedite.

N. It

N. It may be *Iohn* by *ſeuen Angels* vnderſtandeth an *vncertaine number* for a *certaine*: as the *ſeuen ſpirits* in the *firſt Chapter* are taken for the *Holy Ghoſt*, pouring out ſeuen (that is infinite) *ſpirituall gifts* vpon the *Church*.

I. When the ſeuen plagues are denounced by the ſeuen trumpets, and poured out by the ſeuen Vials of the ſeuen Angels, will you make theſe plagues, trumpets, and vials to be of this vncertaine and indefinite number? will you not hereby inwrap all the Apocalyps in vncertaintie? And were all this granted, might not we ſay that the Angell in Tobit alſo, doth by ſeuen vnderſtand an vncertaine number?

N. But the *number of ſeuen* is *Magicall*: as apeares by the *Storie* of [l] *Balaam*.

I. You may alwell ſay that the ſeuen hornes of the Lambe were Magicall by this reaſon: Indeed to put confidence in the number of ſeauen (as Balaam did) is Magicall: But to vſe that number for the ſignification of perfection, is not only Prophetical, but euen [m] vſuall.

N. Howſoeuer it be not *Magicall*, yet is this number *Popiſh*: For doe not wee blame the *Papiſts* for framing *nine Orders of Angels*, out of *Dionyſius*?

I. Indeed it was too much curioſitie to forge nine orders of nine ſuch words, as either concurre in ſignification (namely, Thrones, Principalities, Dominations, Powers, Vertues) Or be taken from a particular meſſage (as the name

l *Numb.* 23.1.

m *Pſal.* 119.164 *Prou* 9.1.& 24.16.& 26.16

name of Seraphim) or from some speciall representation (as the tearme Cherubim) because they were pourtrayed like Children.) Or bee not found in Scriptures (as the word Archangels) or agree to them all (as the title of Angels: For euen they that stand before God are sent out as [n] messengers.) But what is this to the number of seuen Angels, which is found in Scripture?

n *Math.*18.10. *Luke* 1.19. *Heb.*1.14.

N. From the *number of Angels*, I proceed to *their office*, or *action*: which is *ordinarie*, or *extraordinarie*. Of the *first kind* is the *bringing* of the Prayers of the *Saints to memorie*; or the *presentation of them to God*; which the [o] *Angell* in *Tobit* doth arrogate vnto himselfe; being the *peculiar office of Christ*, as appeareth in the [p] *vision* of *Iohn*.

o *Tobit.*12.12. & 15.

p *Apoc.*8.3.

I. How did Elias call the widdowes sinnes to remembrance before [q] God.

q 1.*Kings* 17.18

N. The *widdow* thought hee did it by his *prayers*.

I. And how doth the Deuill accuse the Brethren, day, and [r] night?

r *Apoc.*12.10.

N. He doth vrge *God* with the *memory of our sinnes*.

I. Why is Satan said to stand at the right hand of the wicked when they [s] pray; yea and sometimes of the [t] godly?

s *Psal.*109.6. t *Zach.*3.1.

N. Hee doth it to *accuse* the *one*: and to *resist* the *other* in his *prayers*.

I. Why did the Angell stand at the right hand

hand of Zachary, when hee told him that his prayer was [u] remembred? The like phraſe to which is found in the Angels ſpeech to [x] Cornelius?

N. I know not, except it were to declare that he helped the *one*, or the *other* in his *prayer*.

I. Why make you ſcruple of that? Thinke you the Angell was not as readie to helpe Zacharie, as Satan was to hinder Ioſhua?

N. It may bee the *Angell* did helpe: But the *manner* of the *helpe* is *vnknowne*.

I. If the Angell receiued his prayer; why might he not preſent it to God?

N. It is *Popiſh* to ſay the *Angell* receiued his *ſupplication*.

I. Did not the Angell receiue Lotsy Prayer? [y] *Gen.*19.21.

N. That *Angell* was *Chriſt*; For it is ſaid in the *Storie*, that *Iehouah* from *Iehouah rained downe* [z] *fier*, &c. [z] *Gen.*19.24.

I. Iehouah did it, but by his Angels, whom he ſent to deſtroy the a place. a *Gen* 19.13.

N. But will you haue God put in minde by *Angels*, as *Princes* are by *their Remembrancers*?

I. God hath no ſuch need as Princes haue; and yet he accepteth of the prayers of Men and Angels, who doe in a ſort call things to his memorie, as you heard before of Eliah.

N. Doe you thinke then (with *Papiſts*) that *Angels* pray for *Men*?

I. That the Saints in Heauen doe in generall pray for vs, is denied of none: But why the

u *Luke* 1.11,12

x 1. *Acts* 10.4.

Angels (who know our wants in many particulars; and abound with Charitie, asmuch as the Saints) should not in speciall pray for vs, either render you a reason, or call it not Popish.

N. This yet will helpe the *Popish opinion* touching the *invocation* of *Angels*.

I. A Christian that is in Tartaria prayes for his friend at Mosco: May the Muscouite therefore desire his absent friend to pray for him?

N. Hee may by a *messenger*, or *letter*; but not else.

I. So the Angels pray for vs; yet may not we request them so to doe, unlesse they appeare to vs (which is rare) or we could dispatch some messenger to them, which is impossible.

I. But *Christ* onely presenteth the *prayers of Saints*; as you heard by *Iohn's Vision*.

I. Such a mysticall place will hardly be argumentative: But were it granted that this Angell was Christ; wee may thus answere: that Christ alone doth present the prayers of all the Saints in his owne reall intercession: Doth this hinder: that an Angell may not present some mens particular Prayers; and in his own Prayer recommend them to God, through Christs merits! It is true, Angels pray for vs, and assist vs: But because wee are ignorant when they doe it, it were too much familiaritie to intreate their prayer; of whose presence we are uncertaine.

N.

N. Then you make *Angels*, *Mediatours* of *interceßion*; which is only *Chriſt's royaltie.*

I. No more then we make Abraham becauſe hee prayed for [a] Lot. Yea Beza will tell you, that the Mediator mentioned by Saint [b] Paul was Moſes.

a *Gen.*19.29.
b *Gal* 3.19.

N. Though Maſter *Caluin* be of an other opinion: (namely that it was *Chriſt:* yet with reuerence I rather aſſent to Maſter *Beza*) namely, that *Moſes* was in a ſort a *Mediatour of interceſſion*; yet ſubordinate vnder *Chriſt.*

I. The ſame we affirme of Angels: yet with this caution; that they muſt bee preſent to vs, as Moſes was to the Iſraelites, before we may intreate their Prayers.

N. From the *ordinary action* of *Angels*, wee deſcend to the *extraordinarie*; namely, *eating* and *ſpeaking*; the *firſt*, exceeding the *order* of *Nature:* the *ſecond* of *Moralitie.* Touching the *former*; the *Angell* in [c] *Tobit*, ſaith, *I did neither eate nor drinke, but you ſaw it in a Viſion*; whereas the *Angels* which were gueſts to *Abraham* and *Lot*, did eate [d] *really.*

c *Tobit* 12. 19.
d *Gen.*18.8.& 19.3.

I. That word really, is by you added to the text: But tell me did not you tearme him an Angell that appeared to Manoah? Did not he refuſe to eate? Is not this reaſon thereof rendred there, becauſe hee was an Angell? as if it had beene ſaid, Manoah knew not that hee was an Angell; for then he would not haue inuited him to meat: So that, if we take things

in the most vulgar meaning, **Angels may sometimes** eate; **sometimes** refuse to eate; **sometimes** eate in a vision: **But to speake properly,** Angels cannot eate?

N. Why? Doe they not assume *true bodies of men?* Is it not thought the *Deuils propertie* to assume *aerie bodies?*

I. **Although they that so say, cannot proue what they say, yet to grant your saying, what will you gaine?** That bodie that eateth, must be vnited, and not only assumed; But the bodies of Angels are assumed, not vnited (**for they haue no** vegatiue **nor** sensitiue soule:) They therefore cannot eate.

N. Doe the *Good Angels* then deceiue men?

I. **They cause men to beleeue, that** they are men, **when indeed they are** [e] **not: this is not** deceit, **but** concealing **of the truth for a season.**

N. From *Angels eating*, I come to their speaking: concerning which we are much displeased that the *Angell* in [f] *Tobit* calls himselfe *Azaria*, the sonne of *Hanania* [g] the *Great:* and makes himselfe to be of the *Tribe* of [h] *Nepthali.*

I. **Concerning the** first: **some men well expert in** Hebrew, **doe thus answere: that** Azariah **signifieth** a helper from God; **and** Hananiah, **the** mercifull of God: **The former name may agree to an** Angell; **the latter to** Christ: **For** Angels **are called the** [i] sonnes of God: **and we the** brethren [k] of Christ: **But wee doe rather imbrace** an other **lesse** subtile, **but more**

safe

e *Heb.* 13. 2.

f *Tobit* 5. 12.
g So *Iunius* trrnslatethit.
h *Tobit* 7 3.

i *Iob* 1. 6.
k *Heb.* 2. 17.

safe answere, namely, that the Angell spake according to his appearance only.

N. This is *equivocall forgerie.*

I. What if the Authour of the Storie, had called the Angell Azariah?

N. Hee had belied the *Angell*; for himselfe auouched his name to be *Raphael.*

I. The Authour of the first Booke of Samuel, saith: that Samuel spake to Saul, seeking his counsaile by the Witch of Endor; Thinke you that he was indeed Samuel, or rather Satan? l 1, *Sam.* 28.15.

N. He is tearmed *Samuel*, because hee appeared in his habit; as also because the *Witch* (or at least *King Saul*) did repute him so to be.

I. So this Angell was taken for Azariah: and therefore for a time bare his name. Concerning the latter place; First, we say that the Angell did not affirme himselfe to bee of that Tribe, but only Tobias: who spake according to that which he saw: Secondly, the Angell himselfe doth secretly insinuate that men ought not to inquire after his tribe and kindred: wherefore these speeches were not lying (as you suppose) but either true (according to the present appearance) or Mysticall.

N. Next to *Good Angels*, wee are to intreate of the *Euill*: And first of their *name* then of their *nature.* Touching the *former*: the m Booke of *Tobit* saith: that the *name* of the *euill spirit* was *Asmodeus*: which seemeth a *name* verie *vncouth.* m *Tobit* 3.8.

I.

I. What thinke you of the name of Beelzebub so often * vsed?

* 2. *Kings* 1.2. *Math* 10.26. *Marke* 3.22. *Luke* 11.15.

N. That the *Deuill* may haue a *name* we grant: But where also doe you reade of this name *Asmodeus*?

I. It is an Hebrew name: signifying a Destroyer; as also doth Abaddon; or [a] Apollyon.

a *Apoc.* 9.11.

N. That is the *King* of the *Turkes*, or *Papists* (as some thinke) not the *Deuill*.

I. The Pope (in your opinion) is Antichrist; and the Turke (as some iudge:) Now; who can bee the King and God of Antichrist but Satan?

N. After the *name* we proceed to the *nature*: wherein we may consider either his *affection*, or his *limitation*. For the first: this [b] *Author* saith, *that the euill spirit loued Sara*: which seemeth to fauour their errour, which mistooke the *place* in [c] *Genesis*; saying that *Angels* (which bee the *sonnes of God*) fell in *loue with the daughters of men* (that is, *women*) according to the fable of *Incubus* and *Succubus*; and that this was the *proper cause* of the *deluge*.

b *Tob* 6.14.

c *Gen.* 6.2.

I. Herod said to his seruants concerning Christ, that hee was Iohn the Baptist, raised from the [d] Dead: Did Saint Matthew fauour the errour of the Herodians or Pythagorians, which fained soules to passe from bodie to bodie?

d *Math.* 14.2.

N. He brought in *Herod* speaking according

to

to his owne *erroneous opinion*: and yet, being an *Historian*, not a *Censor*, did neither *approue* nor *reprooue* him.

I So might this Authour introduce Tobias speaking according to the popular sentence: and yet himselfe be tainted in no sort with this errour. Againe, when Tobias saith, an euill spirit loueth her: the word loue, may signifie to haunt; to keepe company with; to bee accustomed vnto: for so the nature of the Greeke word doth beare: Or else, the spirit might loue her, not in regard of affection, but in respect of his charge: that is, hee might loue, and desire to preserue and keepe her, till Tobias came, that should bee her true husband: because hee was neareſt of her kindred: Or he might loue, that is, lesse hate [e] Sara then the seauen men: whose liues hee tooke away; as wee say the Lions loue only their Keepers, because they seeme to spare them alone. Lastly, if Tobias at that time were in an errour, he afterwards did retract it, telling his Father that the Angell had healed his [f] wife, that is, had freed her from the vngratefull societie of Satan.

N. Hitherto of the *Deuils affection*: now followes his *limitation*: wherein you erre, both in regard of the *meanes*, and *manner*. Touching the *former*; you make the *perfume* of a *fishes liuer* to driue away *Satan*, if you beleeue the *fabulous* and *Magicall* [g] *Tobit*: The like is to bee said of the *healing* of *Tobit's eyes* with the *gall of a* [h] *fish*.

I.

e Compare *Gen.*29.31.

f *Tobit.*12.3.

g *Tob.*6.7. & 16.

h *Tobit.*6.8.

1. If the ſight of the brazen Serpent might cure the [i] Iſraelites: If the ſhout of the Hebrewes and the noyſe of the trumpets caſt downe Iericho's [k] walls: If Eliſha could heale the bitter waters with [l] ſalt, and the deadly pot with [m] meale: If Iſaiah could remoue the byle of Ezekiah with a lumpe of drie [n] figs: If our Sauiour Chriſt could heale the woman that had the bloudie iſſue with a touch of his [o] garment, and the blind man with ſpittle, [p] and water: If Peter's ſhadow could cure the [q] ſicke: If Paul's napkin could driue out [r] Deuils: why might not this perfume at God's appointment expell Aſmodeus? Againe, the Angell in [ſ] Tobit ſaith, that Prayer was to be adioyned thereunto: not vnlike the ſpeech of Chriſt: this kind goes not out but by faſting and [t] Prayer: Both which were vſed by Tobias. Thirdly, [u] Iunius himſelfe ſaith, that the Perfume of Sacrifice was adioyned to the perfume of the fiſhes liuer. The like anſwere will ſerue for the fiſhes gall, whereby the blindneſſe of Tobit was healed.

i *Numb.* 21.9.
k *Ioſhua* 6.20.
l 2. *Kings* 2.21.
m 2. *King* 4.41
n *Iſa.* 38.21.
o *Luke* 8.44.
p *Iohn* 9.6,7.
q *Acts* 5 15.
r *Acts* 19.12. Compare 2. *Kings* 5.10.
ſ *Tobit* 6.18.
t *Math.* 17.21.
u Vpon *Tobit* 6.17.

N. The *ſecond limitation* of the *Deuill* was his *confining* into the *vttermoſt parts of* [x] *Egypt*, which ſeemeth to be meerely *fabulous*.

x *Tobit* 8.3.

I. The Deuils deſired that they might not be commanded to goe out into the deepe, that is, into the [y] Sea.

y *Luke* 8.31.

N. By the *Deepe* is meant *Hell*: as in the [z] *viſion* of *Iohn*.

z *Apoc.* 20.2,3.

I. Thinke you the Diuell was in Hell, a thousand yeares together; and neuer came into the earth? Will you produce a Story, that the Diuell was quiet for a thousand yeares from all inuasion, and operatiue temptation? Againe, although the word deepe be so taken in the Apocalypse; yet can it admit no other signification in the Gospell? When it is said in [z] Genesis that darkenesse was vpon the deepe, will you by deepe, vnderstand Hell? or rather the Sea, or waters in generall?

z *Genes.*1.2.

N. Yea, but in the *New Testament*, this word doth onely betoken *Hell:* and indeed whereas, properly it signifies a *bottomlesse place*, it cannot be attributed to *the Sea*, but by a *figure*; forasmuch as the *Sea* hath euery where *a bottome*.

I. When [a] Saint Paul saith, who shall descend into the deepe, &c. will you interprete this of Christs going into Hell? If so you doe, the men of your owne [b] Classis will condemne you. Againe, whereas you affirme Hell and not the Sea to be bottomlesse in proper speech; doe not you suppose Hell to be a Place? Make you Place to be Superficies or Space?

a *Rom.*10.7.

b *H. 1.*

N. I am of the *refined opinion*, that it is a *Space*.

I. Is not euery space finite? If hell be properly bottomlesse; shall it not bee properly infinite; and consequently no place?

N. I grant that the *Deepe* may bee taken elsewhere for the *Sea*: but here it cannot bee so

meant: for the *Diuels* voluntarily did carry the *heard of Swine*, and (by consequent *themselues*) into c the *Sea*.

c *Mark.* 5.13.

I. The Diuels might strike the Swine with dizzinesse or madnesse, and so force them to rush into the Sea, and yet themselues not enter into the same. Secondly, although this place be called a Sea by Saint Marke; yet Saint d Luke termeth it a Lake. Now the Diuels requested that they might not be sent into the Deepe, that is, into the maine Sea: For they were loth to depart out of the Countrey, as appeares by Saint e Marke. Thirdly, they were not so much afraid to enter into the Sea, as to be confined thither, because their ordinary occasions of temptation were found in the Land. Tell me (I pray you) haue not some f Peripatetians confined Angels to the Orbes of Heauen: and some of another g faction to all the Elements? May not we as iustly suppose, that euill spirits are for a season confined into some Places?

d *Luke* 8.33.

e *Mark.* 5.10.

f *Scaliger exercitation.* 359. *Section.* 13.
g *Patritius in nona Philosophia.*

N. That passeth my *skill.*

I. But it passed not your will to contradict.

N. I passe from *Angels* to the *meanes* of our *preseruation*: which either concerne the *body* or the *Soule*. Of the *first kinde* was the *curing of Tobits eyes* with the *gall* of the *fish.*

I. This was answered before, when wee spake of the expelling of Asmodeus.

N. To

N. To the *second sort* appertaine those *immoderate praises* which your *Author* giueth to *Almes*: saying, that it *deliuereth from death*, and *purgeth from* [h] *all sinne*: whereby the *doctrine* of *popish merit* is established.

h *Tob.* 4. 10. & 12. 9. *and* 14. 11.

I. Is not almes by Tobit called righteousnesse? Doth not Salomon say, that [i] righteousnesse deliuereth from death?

i *Pro.* 10. 2.

N. That is not to be vnderstood of the *merit* of *almes* deliuering from *eternall death* (this being the peculiar operation of *Christs passion*) but it is *a way*, wherein if we walke *by faith in Christ*, we shall be safe from *death* of *Soule* and *Body*.

I. The same interpretation might you make of Tobies wordes, if malice did not hinder your voyce, as the siluer squinancie did Demosthenes.

N. But how can *almes* purge *sinne*?

I. How can almes redeeme [k] sinne?

k *Dan.* 4. 24.

N. Indeed the *Chaldie Paraphrast* hath it *redeeme*: But the *Hebrew veritie* saith *breake of*, not *redeeme*.

I. But Caluin telleth you, though we translate it redeeme (according to the Chaldie) yet Popish merit hereby cannot be confirmed.

N. It may bee *in some proper sense* said, that *almes redeeme*, that is, *recompence* our *iniquities* against *our neighbour*: But *our redemption* from the *diuine wrath*, is onely by the *death* of *Christ*.

I. In like manner may we say, that almes

purgeth away ſinne. Furthermore concerning this controuerſie of merit: I take you to bee an incompetent aduerſarie, forſomuch as you vnderſtand not the ſtate of the queſtion, as ſhall bee demonſtrated in another diſputation.

N. Becauſe you ſeeme to put off this Combat: I will paſſe from the *errours* of this *Booke*, touching *things to be beleeued*, to thoſe which concerne *things to be done*.

I. You might haue ſpared all this labour: For we reade neither this, nor any like booke for the eſtabliſhing of the Doctrine of faith, but only for morall inſtruction.

N. But *this booke* is contrary to the *Doctrine of faith*, as hath beene ſhewed by proofe.

I. Your ſhewes haue beene golden, your proofes leaden, as hath beene ſhewed by their reproofe.

N. The *errors* concerning *duties*, are *two*: For either they pertaine to *Marriage*, or to *Buriall*.

l *Tob.* 7. 14. Concerning *Marriage*, this l *Author* ſeemeth to make a *Contract*, the ſame in *eſſence* therewith: Whereupon it may ſeeme you haue *miſ-tranſlated* the *place* in m *Mathewes Goſpell* after this manner: *when his mother Mary was married to Ioſeph before they came to dwell together*: whereas it ſhould bee thus rendred, *when ſhe was eſpouſed, &c. Before they came together*. Thus your *interpretation* ſeemeth to make *Marriage* and *Contract* all one in *ſubſtance*; as alſo to inferre that

m *Math.* 1. 18.

our

our Saviour was conceiued *in* or *after Marriage.*

I. Concerning the first point, it may thus appeare out of the [n] Law, where the espoused woman is called a Wife; and if shee bee convicted of wilfull vnchastity, is reputed as an Adultereſſe worthy of death: By which it is manifest that a [o] Contract for the present time, differeth not in substance from Marriage (although wee deeme not but that the publique and sollemne ceremonies of Matrimony, are decent, expedient, yee and requisite in regard of our positiue Lawes.) The same is confirmed by the words of the Angel in Saint [c] Mathew: For there Mary being espoused to Ioseph is called his Wife.

n *Deut.* 22.24.

o *De præsenti non de futuro.*

N. The words are thus; *Feare not to take Mary to thy wife.*

I. They are neither so in the Greeke, nor so translated; But are thus read; Feare not to take Mary thy [p] Wife; whereby it was declared, that she was then actually his Wife.

p *Math* 1.20.
q Μαριὰμ τὴν γυναῖκά σου
Non ἐις τὴν γυναῖκα.

N. Now proue you the *second point*, namely, that *Christ was conceiued in Marriage.*

I. It appeares partly by that which hath beene said; partly by two other reasons. First it was most safe for Christ then to by conceiued, that all shew of scandall might then bee auoyded: For the Iewes being scrupulous Calculators of time (if this occasion of slaunder had beene presented) would readily haue ac-

accused him as base borne: whereas we neuer finde that they so did.

N. They could not so accuse him considering *he was borne in wedlocke.*

I. Howsoeuer the conueniencie of our Positiues Lawes herein may bee iustified; yet the Iewes both did and doe hold that Children begotten out of Marriage are base: Neither doe you aduisedly auoide the scandall: For if shee were with childe after the espousall, before Marriage (as you pretend) the Iewes would haue alleadged against her the capitall Law in Deuteronomy before named. My second reason is taken from the agreement of time: For S. [r] Luke reporteth Christ to haue been conceiued when as Iohn the *Baptist*, had been six moneths in his mothers wombe: After which time the Virgin remayned with Elizabeth [s] three moneths: And six moneths after (according to the computation of our Church) was deliuered of Our Saviour.

[r] *Luke* 1.26.36

[s] *Luke* 2.5,6.

N. It may seeme by the *Storie* of the [t] *Gospel*, that *Mary* was found by the *swelling* of her *bodie* to be *bigge with childe.*

[t] *Matth.* 1.18.

I. Could that swelling shew that she was with child by the holy Ghost? And yet is it not there auouched that she was found so to haue beene?

N. How then was she *so found?*

I. By her owne narration to Ioseph, according to the relation made to her by the [u] Angell.

[u] *Luke* 1.33.

N. Why then did *Ioseph* purpose to *send her away, lest he should make her a publike example?* Did

not he feare that *ſhee* had committed *fornication* before *contract*, or *adultery* ſince that time?

I. Nothing leſſe: But hee feared to retaine her with him, becauſe he knew not what vocation he had to be Father to ſuch a Child as was conceiued and borne out of the limits of nature.

N. But how could hee be *vnwilling* to make her a *publique example*, ſeeing *ſhe had conceiued in marriage*?

I. The Greeke [x] word ſignifieth to make a common talke of: So might hee haue done if he had put her away publiquely: For then would euery man haue accuſed her of fornication or adulterie.

x παραδειγματίσαι.

N. But had *ſhee* beene his *wife*, he could not ſo haue *put her away*: eſpecially being *a iuſt man*, as it is there ſaid: For he muſt haue accuſed her according to the *Law of* [y] *Moſes*?

y Deuit. 22. 13. &c.

I. Hee could not ſo accuſe her, being a iuſt man: becauſe he beleeued her narration concerning her conception, by the Holy Ghoſt.

N. But had ſhee beene *his wife*, why did hee not *keepe company with her*?

I. The Greeke word ſignifieth to dwell together, aſwell as to keepe companie. Beſides, if this latter ſhould be meant, it may be conceiued that the Marriage Feaſt laſted ſeuen dayes as did that of [z] Sampſon: So that hee might not go into her till the ſeuenth day of the Feaſt.

z *Iudg.* 14. 12.

N. The *latter dutie* concerneth *Buriall*: Of which your *Authour* ſpeaketh on this [a] manner:

a *Tobit* 4. 17.

Powre

Poure thy bread vpon the buriall of the iust; But *giue nothing to the wicked*: which words are contrarie to those of b *Paul*, where hee willeth vs *to doe good to all, especially to the houshold of faith.*

b *Gal.* 6.10.

1. **Although we acknowledge the doctrine to bee true, That vpon certaine** cautions, **wee ought to be liberall aswell to the** euill **as to the** good: **yet wee auouch, that you are deceiued both in the** place **of Saint** Paul, **as also of** Tobit. **Touching the** former **the** coherence **doth shew: that by the** houshold of faith **wee are to vnderstand the** Ministers of the Church. **For the** c **Apostle saith**, Let him that is taught in the Word, make him that teacheth him partaker of all his goods: **whereof making** this reason (Because we shall reape as wee d sowe) **hee thus concludeth**, whilst wee haue therefore time, let vs doe good vnto all men; especially vnto them which are of the houshold of faith.

c *Gal.* 6.6.

d *Gal.* 6.7. *ad* 10.

N. But what then is the meaning of *Tobit* in his charge to his sonne?

1. **In summe it is this:** giue Feasts for the comfort of the children of the iust in their mourning e for their parents deceased, who thereby are also honoured: But giue no such honour to wicked men. **Thus you see your twelue cauils against the Booke of** Tobit **to vanish into** smoake.

e *Ier.* 16.7.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

Of Iudeth: and the Song of the three children.

NOw from the *Legend* of *Tobit*, I passe to the *Fable* of *Iudeth*: wherein wee dislike both *word* & *matter*. Touching the *first*; wee thinke that the terme [a] *Titans* doth not sauour of the *simplicitie* of *Gods Spirit* but of some *Pagan Poet*.

a *Iud.* 16.7.

I. You are like Domitian: you will kill flies for want of men, and pursue words for lacke of matter. But what? did not Saint Paul and Saint Iames borrow words from Poets? Is Poetrie now become so base in your eyes, that you cast it downe from the mountaine of dignitie into the valley of scorne?

N. Diuine Poesie I acknowledge to bee a *part* of *Theologie*: as being vsed by *Moses*, *Miriam*: the *Author* of *Iob*, *Debora*; *Hanna*, *Dauid*, *Isaiah*; *Habacuck*; and *others*: but the *prophane words* of *heathenish* and *fabulous Poets* wee cannot endure.

I. What thinke you of the word Hell vsed [b] eleuen times in the New Testament? was it drawne from the Heathen Pluto? Doe not

b 1. *Mat.* 11. 23. & 16. 18. *Luke* 10. 15. & 16. 23. *Act.* 2. 27. & 31. 1. *Cor.* 15. 55. *Apoc.* 1. 18. & 6. 8. & 20. 13. 14.

you indeauour to proue that ᾅδης may signifie Heauen aswell as Hell; to the intent that your interpretation of that clause in the Creede, hee descended into hell, that is, his soule ascended into Heauen might seeme to haue the better coherence? whence do you fish these your proofes but out of the ponds of Poets?

N. The *Poets* doe sufficiently shew that ᾅδης doth betoken *a place of Ioy*, aswell as of *Paine*.

I. Indeed they place Elisium in Hell: but, that they mingled Heauen (whither they sent their Heroes,) with Hell, cannot be confirmed out of their Poems. But now (I pray you) tell me: had you beene at the framing of that Booke of Iudeth, what word would you haue vsed instead of Titans, which should haue bin equipollent to the name of Giants, vnlesse you condemne that name also?

N. I will not busie my selfe about amending that which is all faultie: and yet I must ingenuously confesse that I cannot dislike the name *giant*, forasmuch as it is found in c *Genesis* and d *Ioshua*.

c Gen. 6. 4.
d Ios. 15. 8.

I. Doe you remember whence the name giant is deriued?

N. It may bee from *Gyges* or *Gog* the *King* of the *Lydians*: But the receiued opinion is, that it is deduced from *being borne of the* e *earth*.

e Tuyreis.

I. Indeed wee reade that the earth (in the Poets) did bring forth giants: but will you beleeue that men came of the ground like mushromes?

shromes? By this you may perceiue, that the word giant is as poeticall as that of Titan; as also that the Storie of Iudeth is not (as you pretend) like the verses of Dionysius, amended only by blotting out. But now (I pray you) cease to bee like Antoninus) a cutter of [f] Cummin; and so come on to the matter.

[f] Κυμινοπρίστης

N. In the *matter* then, wee disallow both the *circumstances* and *actions*: Of the *first ranke* are *time* and *place*: Concerning the *time* of this *Storie* it cannot be declared with any *certaintie*: and therefore it must needs be a *Fable*, or, at least a *Parable*.

I. The Stories of Iob and Ruth; and (it may be) of Hester, will hardly admit any determination of time: will you burie these also in the graue of Fables? I beleeue it would moleste you to make a true Chronologie of the Booke of Iudges: or of Daniels seuentie weekes. Yea, if you were strictly examined in what yeare or age, the eleuen Tribes fought with Beniamin: Or in what yeare of Herod, Our Sauiour was borne: or how many yeares he preached vpon the earth: or how long time is calculated in the Storie of the Acts; you would be as dumbe as a man at the first sight of a Wolfe. Shall all these things be fabulous therefore, because wee (liuing in the prison of ignorance) cannot cleerely discerne the light of truth? Againe it is more then probable that the Storie of Iudeth fell out vnder the raigne of King Manasses.

N. The *vntruth* of this *assertion* may be shewed *three wayes:* First thus; In the *time* of *Manasses* the *Temple* was not destroyed, as appeareth by *his* g *Story:* But it was leuelled with the ground in the dayes of h *Iudeth:* she was not therefore in the time of *Manasses.*

g 2. *King.* 21. 4.
h *Iudeth.* 5. 18

I. To your Minor: First, I oppose other places in i Iudeth: yea, indeed the whole tenour of the Booke euery where affirming the Temple then to haue stood.

i *Iudeth.* 4. 2. & 8. 24.

N. This is but to shew what *contradictions* are in the *Storie.*

I. Nothing lesse: For tell mee, whose words did you alledge?

N. They were the words of *Achior* before *Holophernes.*

I. Doe you beleeue the speech of Rabshakeh when hee said that Hezekiah had taken away the Altar of the k Lord?

k 2. *King.* 18. 22.

N. It was an *ignorant speech* of a Pagan: For the *Altars* demolisht by *Hezekiah* were not the *Lords*, but *heathenish* and *deuillish.*

I. So it may be Achior, being an ignorant Amonite, might vntruly report the destruction of the Temple.

N. It is not likely hee should erre in a *matter of fact*, especially being *so famous.*

I. His words may be otherwise interpreted after this manner: the Temple was made as the ground that is, was reputed prophane, and common ground, namely, during the captiuitie of l Manasses.

l See *Iunius* vpon this Place.

N

N. My ſecond argument is this: It is ſaid that *Iudeth was a faire* [m] *woman:* alſo that *ſhee liued an hundred and fiue* [n] *yeares:* Laſtly, that *there was no trouble in Iſrael for many yeares after her* [o] *death.* Now wee know that from the *death of Manaſſes to the deſtruction of the Temple,* were but *fiftie fiue yeares*; and to the *captiuitie* of *Ieconias* but fortie foure. So that if ſhe were ſixtie yeares old at *the death of Manaſſes* ſhe muſt liue a *whole yeare*, after the *deportation* of *Ieconias.*

m *Iudeth* 8.7.
n *Iudeth* 16.23.
o *Iudeth.* 16.25.

I. Your computation holds together like ropes of ſand. And firſt (I pray you) how old was Sarah, when ſhe was ſaid to bee faire by [p] Abraham?

p *Geneſ.* 12.11.

N. Shee was about the ſixtie fift yeare of her age.

I. The Iewes alſo doubt not to ſay that ſhe was beautifull at the hundreth yeare.

N. What is that to *Iudeth?*

I. It may be ſhe was ſixty yeares old when ſhee came before Holophernes. It may be this was done twentie yeares before the death of Manaſſes: and ſo ſhe might die twentie yeares before the Captiuitie of Ieconias. Can you produce any thing againſt this but your owne confident coniectures? Should you vpon ſo light grounds diſgrace the Stories of Thucidides, Diodorus, or Suetonius, would not men thinke of you, as of the Eſtridge in [q] Iob, that you were depriued of vnderſtanding?

q *Iob.* 39.20.

N. I can ſwallow your *bitter*, or rather *poyſo-*

ned pils: But I come to my *third reaſon* on this manner. This *act* was done by *Iudeth*, either *before* or *in* the *time* of the *Captiuitie of Manaſſes*; or after his *returne* from *Babel*.

I. **The firſt is affirmed by none, as farre as I remember.**

N. The *ſecond* is refuted by the *words* of *Achior:* who ſaith, that *they were then returned from* q *captiuitie.*

q *Iudeth* 5.19.

I. **They that defend this opinion, may anſwere, that as ſome returned from** Babylon **in the daies of** Cyrus: **and ſome not till the time of** Darius Nothus, **about an hundred yeares after: So ſome of** theſe captiues **might haue returned, and yet the** King **remaine in** Bondage.

N. This is but the *opinion* of *Bellarmine*, one of the *Knights of the Poaſt for Romiſh Religion.*

I. **Wee rather thinke it was done after the returne of** Manaſſes.

r *Iudeth* 4.6.

N. Firſt then; Why is r *Ioacim* the Prieſt onely named in this *action* of *warre:* no mention at all being made of the *King*, who was moſt intereſſed therein?

I. **Why is not the** Deuill **named in the** temptation **of** Euah; **and in the** Viſion **preſented to** King Saul: **forasmuch as hee was** principall Agent **in both enterprizes?**

N. Theſe *Stories* are declared not according to *things done*, but after *their appearance.*

I. It

I. It may be King Manasses did not appeare in this matter: For it is probable that he was lately deliuered from the King of Assiria. Hee was not willing openly to be seene in an action which seemed to sauour of rebellion. Furthermore thinke you that Daniel did worship the Image of Nabuchadnezzar because it is not written, that he refused so to doe?

N. His *constancie* euen *to* and *in* the *Lions den* doth sufficiently disclaime this imputation: so that we had rather take shelter of *any coniecture*, then accuse so *holy a Prophet*, and *constant a confessour*: It may be *Daniel* was then employed in some *forraine Prouince*: It may be, though hee were present, yet the *Chaldeans* would not *for reuerence*, or durst not *for feare*, accuse him: or if they did, yet were not heard in their suite. If all these *probabilities* faile, wee must erre on the safer side: and not accuse vpon *groundlesse* and *negatiue presumptions*.

I. Neither may you accuse King Manasses vpon the like vncertainties: For it may bee no memorable thing was done by him in this businesse: It may be as the greatnesse of his sinne caused his repentance not to bee written in the Booke of the Kings; so the same cause of the like silence is to be ascribed to this Authour.

N. Secondly, I thus proue; that this could not bee done after the *returne* of *Manasses*: For, had it beene so, why did *Holophernes* so curiously demand of all his *Captaines* (and by name of

Achior

Achior the *Ammonite*) what was the *particular estate of that Countrey?* If it had beene so lately subdued, and the King carried away in bonds, this inquiry might seeme to haue beene superfluous.

s 2. *Chro.* 33. 11

I. It is written in the[s] Chronicles, that the Lord sent the Captaines of the King of Ashur, who tooke Manasseh, &c. It is more then proble that Holophernes was not of this number of Captaines. It may bee hee was then too young to be a Captaine: It may be, he was then busied in some other expedition: and what though he had beene in that Countrey before? might he not be ignorant of the Chorographie thereof: and especially of their Genealogie? You cannot be ignorant how wildly t Tacitus writes concerning the Iewes, affirming that they came from Ida, a mountaine of Creete; and yet he had conferred both with Vespasian and Titus which ouerthrew Hierusalem.

t *Historiæ lib.* 5.

N. From the *Time*, wee passe to the *Place* or *Scene* of this *Comedie:* which is said to be u *Bethulia*, whereas no such *City* can be found in the *Land of Canaan.*

u *Iudeth* 4. 6.

I. Doe you beleeue that there was such a Citie in Iudea as Hierusalem?

N. Not only *Scriptures*, but euen all *Authors* giue report of such a *Citie.*

I. And yet none can tell now, where this Citie was scituated, howsoeuer we heare fables of Bethara.

N.

N. Howsoeuer this *great desolation* be, at this present, yet we may not so disgrace the *vndoubted stories*, as to make any scruple of the being of *such a Citie*.

I. In like manner neither may you doubt of the being of Bethulia, howsoeuer you find now no such place in the Mapp. I beleeue it would trouble you to shew me all the Cities of Greece (named by Thucidides) in any mapp. Againe the names of sundry Cities, haue beene altred in processe of time: (as [x] Sychar for [y] Shechem) some also haue beene built since the the time of Iosua, when the survey of Canaan was made; (as by name [z] Samaria.)

x *Iohn* 4.5.
y *Gen.*33.18.
z 1.*King.*16.24

N. What is this to *Bethulia?*

I. It might, as well as Samaria, haue been built since the time of Iosua. But the truth is, Bethulia is a name changed from [a] Bethhoglah.

a *Iosh.*18.19 & 21. See *Iunius* vpon *Iudith* 4.6

N. Thus farre of the *circumstances:* now follow the *actions* of *Iudeth*, concerning her *behauiour* either with *God* or *Men*. Of the *first kinde* we haue *Fasting* and *Prayer*. Her *fasting* was *Superstitious*. Forasmuch as she fasted *euery day* but the *Eue* of the *Sabboth-day*, and of the sollemne [b] Feast.

b *Judeth* 8.6.

I. Were it Superstition (as you intimate) what is that to the Historian, who no where doth applaud it? Againe this action of hers, may not onely bee defended, but euen exceedingly praised. First, by this meanes

shee did most exactly and sincerely observe the Sabbath; preparing her body by præcedent rest: For they that approch to the Sabbath with tired bodies like the Romans to their first battell with Hanniball, shall neuer beare away the victorie. Most laudable therefore, and religious is the ancient custome of our Countrey, whereby Saturday was made Halfe-holiday.

N. But this is reckoned amongst the *Iewish Superstitions.*

I. If the Iewes make it part of Gods worship, as they did the washing of their hands before c meate, How can it be preiudiciall to vs who make no such will-worship of it; neither liue neere the Iewes to scandalize them herein? Secondly, shee did herein obserue the nature of fasting and feasting. For as nature passeth not suddenly from one extreame to an other, but layeth hold of the meane or middle terme: So is it preposterous abruptly to goe from fasting to feasting, from mourning to reioycing. For this cause shee fasted not vpon Friday, being the day before the Iewish Sabbath. I will make it plaine by this Diagramme: On Thurs-day shee did fast: that is, shee did neither eate nor reioyce till euening: On Friday shee did eate but not reioyce: On Saturday (which was the Sabbath then) shee did feast, that is, eate with reioycing.

c *Marke 7.4.*

N.

N. Why doe you then fast vpon *Saturdayes*, and the *Eues* of *Holidayes?*

I. Upon the first wee fast onely from certaine kinds, namely from flesh: vpon the second we do fast at euenings alone: Neither of which can properly be tearmed religious fasts: because the former doth not afflict the [d] bodie, the latter doth afflict it in verie gentle manner.

N. To her *fasting* a cousin German was her *prayer*: the impuritie whereof appeareth by *two things*. First, she commendeth the *fact of her father* [e] *Simeon* which *Iacob* notwithstanding did [f] *accuse*.

I. But doth the Authour of the Booke commend her for so doing?

N. It is the *office* of a good *Historian* to declare his *iudgement* concerning those things whereof he makes [g] *relation*.

I. He that told you that, neuer read Genesis: For if he had, he would haue maruelled why Noahs drunkennesse, Lot's incest, Iacobs simonie are neither condemned nor defended. And were this Canon of yours strictly obserued, wee should banish Historians out of the World, as the Turke doth Rhetoricians.

N. Yea, but your *Authour* commended *Iudeth* as a *vertuous woman*.

I. So were they vertuous men, whom I now named. Nay, were not Sara and Rahel, vertuous women, whose vices though they be related, yee are not particularly reproued by Moses.

d *Leuit.* 16. 29.

e *Iudeth* 9. 2.
f *Gen.* 49. 7. Compared with *Chap.* 34. 25.
g *Cicero lib.* 2. *De Oratore.*

N. But yet *her prayer* is *most vngodly*, blessing that which *God* hath cursed.

I. What thinke you of Balaam's going to King Balak?

N. It was an *accursed act* of *auarice*: therefore the *Lords* wrath was kindled [h] against him.

h *Numb.* 22.22

I. Notwithstanding the same Lord commanded him to [i] goe.

i *Numb.* 22.20.

N. Hee was not angry for his *going*; but for that he went with an *euill minde*, namely, *to accurse the people of God* (if it were possible) and especially to lade himselfe with the *thicke clay of Egypt*.

I. And what opinion haue you of Iehu, for destroying Ahab's house?

Did not *God* commend and reward him for that *Heroicall* [k] action?

k 2. *Kings* 10.3.

I. And yet the [l] Prophet condemnes it for a bloudie fact.

l *Hosea* 1.4.

N. It may be his *minde* was bloudie, howsoeuer he obeyed *God* in the *externall act*.

I. In like manner, though the outward act of Simeon were euill; yet might his intent bee good: namely, the punishment [m] of lust.

m *Gen* 34.31.

N. A *good intent* alone, makes not the *action good*.

I. But a good intent may not bee tearmed euill and therefore Iudeth for this intent might praise Simeon. For (if you obserue it) Iacob doth not simply accurse the fact, but the rage, where with it was performed. Yea, hee ascribeth

crſbeth the deed to himſelfe in part, as appeares by his ſpeech to [n] Ioſeph: the reaſon whereof may bee this, becauſe the people of Shechem were accurſed in their [o] Grandfather Canaan. Beſides did not Herod and Pilate, that [p] which God had determined?

N. God's determination could neither *excuſe* them, nor *Simeon.*

I. Yea but that which God determineth cannot be vniuſt, howſoeuer hee vſe vniuſt inſtruments. Iudeth then praiſeth God for reuenging luſt, euen by the Sword of cruell Simeon.

N. This is like *Sixtus Quintus* his *Panegyricall Oration* vpon the death of the *French King*, *Henry* the third, ſlaine by that *vnmercifull Clement*: wherein *the prouidence of God* was magnified.

I. This is an odious, and yet not foure footed compariſon: For Shechem deſerued death, though Simeon was but an haſtie and vncalled agent therein. But no ſuch thing can be auouched of that Prince, who was as vniuſtly murthered by that Monke: as *Henry* the Fourth was of late by Francis Raualliac of Angoleſme.

N. The *ſecond fault of that Prayer* is, that ſhe *prayes* for *God's aſſiſtance* in her [q] *craft.*

I. Did you neuer heare of Dolus malus, euill craft?

N. What is that to *Iudeth?*

I. If there bee euill, why may there not bee good

n *Gen.* 48. 22.

o *Gen* 9. 25.

p *Acts* 4 28.

p *Iudeth* 9. 13.

good craft also, as is to bee seene in the stratagems of warre mentioned in the Bible?

r *Iosh.* 8. 19. *Iudg.* 7. 20. & 20. 4. 2. *Sam.* 5. 23.

N. But the *craft* of *Iudeth* was wicked as appeareth by her *behaviour* towards *men.*

I. Although shee might faile in the circumstances of that craft, wherein shee desired to prosper, yet might her intent and prayer bee godly.

N. In her *behaviour* I note *two couples of lies:* The *former* shee told to the *Souldiers*, the latter to *Holophernes*: The *two first* are set downe in *her speech* to the [f] *watch*: For *first*, shee said, that the *Bethulians* (from whom shee fled) should bee deliuered into the hands of the *Assirians*, which was more then her *knowledge*, and contrarie to her *hope.*

f *Iudeth* 10. 12, 13.

I. What thinke you of the speeches of [t] Iacob, [u] Rahab, of [x] Dauid, and of the woman at [y] Enrogel?

t *Gen.* 27. 19. & 33. 14.
u *Iosh.* 2. 4.
x 1. *Sam.* 21. 2.
y 2. *Sam.* 16. 20

N. They were *lewd* and *loud lies.*

I. Your Censers are perfumed with Wormewood, not with Frankincense: But why doe you not condemne the Bookes of Genesis, Ioshua, and Samuel for these lies?

N. They doe indeed relate them; yet doe they not commend them.

I. Neither yet doe they condemne them: And may you not with the same pensill whiten the walls of this our Authour likewise? Besides Iudeth spake true according to their opinion as Dauid did to King Achish, when he told

told him that hee had roued against the South of * Iuda; for the King thought he had spoiled the Tribe of Iuda; whereas Dauid vnderstood the Amalekites, dwelling in the same Southern Coasts.

* 1.Sam.27.10.

N. This is like the *Anabaptists:* who being demanded *whether they beleeue the resurrection of the bodie?* Will answer that *they doe:* meaning *they beleeue such to bee your beleefe*: Or like the *Papists* who being asked whether *King Iames* be a *lawfull King*? affirme that *hee is*; meaning in the *receiued opinion* of the *multitude* of this *Realme:* Howbeit if *strength* were not wanting the *Bull of Pius the fift*, and the *Breues* of *Clement the Eighth*, and Paul *the fift*, should bee in force against him.

I. You shew of what spirit you be, in accusing Dauid of Anabaptisticall and Popish equiuocation. Either relinquish this censorious ignorance, or else men will rather iudge you to be led by the Moone, then by reason.

N. What? Doe you defend *equiuocation*, which was not inuented by *George Southwell*, but by him that vsed *those foure Equiuocations* to our *Grandmother Euah:* First, *you shall not die*, that is *presently:* Secondly, *your eyes shall bee opened*, that is; the *eyes* of your *consciences:* Thirdly, *you shall be like Gods or Angels*, that is, *euill Angels:* Fourthly, *you shall know good and* [a] *euill*, that is, not by *theorie*, but by *lamentable* and *late experience*.

z 1.Sam.27,10.

I.

1. To equivocate before a Magistrate, an oath being tendred (as Anabaptists and Papists doe) we hold it a thing dissonant to Religion and policie. Nenertheles to speake doubtfully to a professt enemie, no kind of oath being administred; and to conceale from him that part of truth which we may not vtter, howsoeuer we be tormented, wee maintaine it not only to be lawfull, but also safe and necessarie: All which was performed by Iudeth to the souldiers in this first lie (as you tearme it.)

N. But the *second lie* yet lies heauie vpon her, when she said *she would tell* Holophernes *nothing but truth:* whereas indeed shee patched *two famous lies* before him. First, she told him that *no punishment could come vpon the Israelites except they sinned against God.*

b 1 *Apoc.* 2. 14. 1. It is probably collected out of S. b Iohn; that this was taken from the Counsell of Balaam, who thought that Israel could not bee troubled, vnlesse it were ensnared with Idolatry or Adulterie. And surely the ground of this aduise was most profound: forasmuch as no diuine iudgement can ouertake a nation vntill it bee guiltie of the impunitie of some knowne transgression; which maxime if you denie, you will hardly auoid an axiome of Atheisme.

N. The *next lie* before *Holophernes* is yet more apparant: For she tels him that the *men of* Bethulia *were readie to eate vp things consecrate to God*, which (as she pretended) *should haue beene*

a great ſinne: whereas ſhe knew that *theſe things* might bee vſed by them in caſe of *extreme neceſſitty.*

I. To grant that ſhe knew this; How was ſhee bound to reueale this to the Tyrant, and enemie of the Church? Did not Iael the like to Siſera, when ſhe ſaid [c] feare not?

[c] *Iudg.*4.18.

N. One mule may claw another: For it ſeemeth this *fable* of *Iudeth* was taken from the *Storie of Iael.*

I. I wonder you called not that fable alſo, conſidering that Debora (being a Propheteſſe) did tearme Iael bleſſed among women [d] for the very like fact. Neither indeed is the phraſe of Vzziah vnlike to this in the commendation of [e] Iudeth.

[d] *Iudg.*5.24.

[e] *Iudeth* 13.18

N. But *Iael* firſt of all did breake the *peace* made betweene *Iabin*, the King of *Canaan*, and the houſe of her *husband* [f] *Heber.*

[f] *Iudg* 4.17.

I. I pray you, were you preſent at the contract of that peace? was it made with a League or without it? If the latter, then no promiſe was violated: If with a League; was it a League of amitie (ſo that each was bound to helpe other in all warfare?) Or was that a League of equalitie? (ſo that both were indifferently reſtrained from moleſting and inuading the friends of the Confederate partie:) The former you can neuer euince: If it were the latter, the King of Canaan had firſt broken the league by inuading the Iſraelites, and ſo Iael

was free. Besides, howsoeuer there were a league: yet if God by immediate instinct did ordaine the contrarie, Iael was absolued from all humane bonds: the like instinct may be supposed to haue beene in Iudeth.

N. But *Iael* said *feare not*: when there was indeed *true cause of feare.*

I. Although she interdicted him to feare, yet she promised no securitie.

N. It was an *implicite promise.*

I. But this is of small force, with a sworne enemie to Gods Church, such as was Sisera.

N. This will make good that which was confirmed in the *Councell of Constance*: Namely, that *faith is not to be kept with Heretiques.*

I. I will not now scan the meaning of that Decree: only I answere: That shee made no faith with Sisera, when she said, feare not: for it may be she meant, feare not in regard of *Barak* and the *Israelites* that pursue thee.

N. This is but an *equiuocall shift*, which you can neuer confirme.

I. As your selfe said of Daniel: so we say of Iael: we will rather flie to any coniecture, then accuse a woman commended by so great a Propheteese as was Debora: Now the fact of Iudeth was not vnlike that of Iael.

N. It is not likely that the *Bethulians* were about to eate the *things that were consecrated*: no such matter being else-where specified in the *Storie.*

I.

I. Wee will rather beleeue her affirmation, which had better meanes to know it, then you, that be ignorant thereof. And thus your ten imputations and aſperſions caſt vpon this Booke, are now become like painted dreames of the ſhadow of ſmoake, being dreamed by a doting, ſickly, waking man.

N. I weigh your words as winde: and come from *Whole Stories* to a *Fragment*, called the *Song of the three Children*, out of which *your Benedicite* is taken: rehearſed by you after the *firſt Leſſon* inſtead of *Te Deum*.

I. If this offend you, it lies in the diſcretion of the Miniſter whether hee will repeate it or not: For in the place thereof, hee may ſay Te Deum: vnleſſe it alſo be tedious to your quick-ſiluer minted eares. But what is that in the Benedicite which moues your choller.

N. Firſt, it is ſaid, *That the fire went out forty nine* g *Cubits.*

I. Where begins the Benedicite?

N. At theſe words. *O all yee workes*, &c.

I. That is ten Verſes after the place by you h alleadged: So that it may bee that they, which diſliked the Storie, could not diſallow this Song read in our Church.

N. This *Song* is a *Part* of the *Storie*: and therefore is to be reiected, if the Storie be found *reprobate ſiluer.*

I. The Song may bee rehearſed for morall inſtruction; howſoeuer the Hiſtorie which is not

g The Song of the three Children, *Verſe* 47.

h The Song of the three Children, *Verſe* 57.

not rehearsed, should erre from some part of truth. But now what is the hole in this relation?

N. It is vtterly impossible the *Chaldeans* should cast in Naphtha, *pitch, towe, and faggots* into the *furnace*, if the flame did issue there from so many Cubits.

I. Some Mechanicall Artizan could teach you a deuice, how to cast fuell into a fornace without perill, being distant aboue fortie nine Cubits, though tripled: Againe, it will bee hard for you to proue, that the fire went forward, and did not ascend vpwards: Lastly, though this were granted: yet no impossibilitie would follow: For this may be the meaning of the place, That the flame brake out of the fornace, and went fortie nine Cubits, and so burnt the Chaldeans. This is confirmed by the words of [i] Daniel, where it is said because the King's commandement was straight, the fire slue the Chaldeans; that is, because they fearing the rigorous commandement of the King did ouer-heate the fornace, the fire suddenly came out and slue them: wher of the reasons may bee rendred: First, their preposterous haste: Secondly, their casting in of Naphtha, pitch and towe, which might wonderfully inflame the other fuell: Thirdly, because the Angell did shake the fire out of the fornace, with a hissing [k] winde.

i *Dan.* 3. 22.

k Song of the three Children, *verse* 49

N. You heale one errour with an other: For

Na-

l *Nabuchadnezzar* saith, that *the men walked in the midst of the fire.*

l Dan 3.25.

I. This is the Kings meaning, that they walked in the midst of the furnace, being the place of the fire: neither is it improbable that some winde or dew was brought by the Angell to abate the violence of the fire.

N. It were more miraculous to say: that the *fire* was *restrained from burning.*

I. Miracles and Monsters are not to bee multiplied without necessitie. It had beene more miraculous that the Hebrewes had beene fed with Manna in Canaan, and yet the Manna there m ceased. In like manner, it had beene more strange if the graue garments had falne from Lazarus of their owne accord; yet Christ commanded him to bee n loosed by men. For where the naturall strength of Angels or Men will serue: why should we exact a miracle, as it were to tempt, and o limit the Almightie.

m *Iosh.* 5.12.

n *Iohn* 11.44.

o *Psal.* 78.41.

N. *Two fragments* there bee separated from the *beginning* of *Daniel*, commonly termed the thirteenth and fourteenth Chapters of that book (namely the *Storie* of *Susanna*, and of *Bel* and the *Dragon*:) In the *Historie* of *Susanna* wee dislike *the matter*, and *the phrase*. As for the *matter*, it is neither *sound* for *substance*, nor *circumstance*. For the first, it is manifest that *Daniel* was not aduanced vpon that occasion that this *Storie* p pretends, namely, for *deliuering Susanna from death* by his *Prophetical sentence*: but rather for the

The Story of *Susanna*, and of *Bel* and the *Dragon*.

p *Susanna v.* 63

the *interpretation* of *Nabuchadnezzar's Dreame*, as is to be seene in the *true* q *Daniel*.

q Dan. 2. 48.

1. **We may easily conceiue a** double aduancement of Daniel: **First, whereby he came into credit with the** People **by the occasion of the** matter **of** Susanna: **Secondly, whereby hee came into reputation before the** King, **for** expounding **of his** Dreame. Againe, although the King **tooke notice of** Daniel's iudgement **concerning** Susanna: **Yet was it possible that hee should not aduance him: either because hee was verie young or because hee thought this iudgement proceeded from** dexteritie of wit: **not from** diuine inspiration: **Or lastly, because hee might bee as** forgetfully ingratefull **towards** Daniel, **as afterwards was** Balthazar, **till hee was aduertised thereof by the** Queene r Mother.

r Dan. 5. 10.

N. The *circumstance* of *time* doth more conuince this *Booke*: and that for *two reasons*: First, it appeares by this *narration*, that the *Iewes* had *yearely Iudges* in *Babylon*; and power to execute the [s] *Lawes of Moses*; which is no way probable.

s Susanna, v. 5. & 41. & 62.

1. **First,** Nabuchadnezzar **and** Darius **aduanced some of the** Iewes **in** t Babylon: **Secondly,** Hamman **tels** Ahashuerosh **that the** Iewes **obserued their owne** u Lawes: **Thirdly, the** Romanes **which kept downe the** Iewes **as much as the** Babylonians, **yet gaue them leaue in some cases to keepe the** capitall Lawes **of** Moses, **as appeares by** Saint x Iohn, **and by**

t Dan. 2. 48. 49.

u Hest. 3. 8.

x Iohn 18. 31.

Saint

Saint [y] Luke. **Wherefore this is not so vnprobable as you would haue it.**

N. Secondly, against the *time* I thus reason: *Daniel* is said to be a [z] *young childe*: and yet this *Storie* is reported to be done in the *time* of *Cyrus*: [a] but this is impossible: For *Daniel* was carried away in the *beginning* of the [b] *Captiuitie*, which lasted *seuentie* [c] *yeares*, euen to the *first yeare* of the raigne of [d] *Cyrus*: So that *Daniel* could not be lesse then *eightie yeares old* in the *first yeare* of *Cyrus*.

I. **First, Some doubt not to auouch this to be another Daniel.**

N. To what end then is this *Storie* annexed to *his Booke*?

I. **That might be done, because they were** men of the same name, nation, spirit and happinesse. **But I relinquish this opinion as vncertaine and improbable. The** plaine answere is this, **that those words concerning** Astyages and Cyrus **in the end of** Susanna, **are taken out of the** beginning of Bel **and the** Dragon, **as is plaine by the** Greeke Text: **Your** calculation **therefore is needlesse.**

N. From the *matter* I come to the phrase: For it semes by the *Greeke*, that there should be an allusion in *Daniels speech* to the *words* [e] of the *Elders*, which allusion is not found in the *Hebrew*, or *Chaldie* tongues.

I. **First, no marueil, if it cannot bee found:** For the names of Easterne trees are little knowne

y *Acts* 7.58.

z *Susanna v.*45

a *Susanna v.*65

b *Dan.*1.1.

c *Ierem.*29.10.

d *Ezra*1.1.

e *Susanna v.*54 & 58.
ὑπὸ σχίνον σχίσει μέσον. ὑπὸ πρίνον μέλει σε ἄγγελος πρίσαι σε μέσον.

knowne to the Grecians, & the rest in Europe, as all Herbals doe witnesse: Secondly, though the Greeke Interpreter did allude, it followes not herevpon that there was an allusion in the Hebrew or Chaldie: Thirdly, if all bee granted, as also that the Storie is Apocryphall; will you herevpon conclude that it is false and not to be read in the Church for morall vse, namely to shew how God defendeth innocencie, and conuinceth lust, and malice?

N. I passe from *Susanna* to *Bel* and the *Dragon*: wherein we disclaime *two things*: First, it is said, that *Daniel* was *six dayes* in the *Lions* [m] *den*; whereas it is said in the *true* [g] *Daniel*, that *hee remained there but one night.*

I. The Stories speake of two seuerall facts and times: The first vnder Darius; The second vnder Cyrus.

N. *Darius* was *Cyaxares* the Vncle of *Cyrus*: and raigned with him in *Babylon.*

I. This Storie is vncertaine: for Scaliger proues that Darius raigned ten yeares before Cyrus came: which if it bee true, your argument is at an end: Againe, [h] others thinke that Xenophon, who tels your Storie, is meerely fabulous, and that Herodotus tels the truth, saying that Astyages had neuer a childe but Mandana the Mother of Cyrus.

N. Secondly, we wonder that *Habacuk* should [i] here be mentioned: who was before the *Captiuitie*, as appeares by his [k] *prophecie.*

I.

f *Bel* and the *Dragon*, *v.*31.
g *Dan.*6.19.

h Master *William Perkins in Digesto.*

i *Bel* and the *Dragon*, *v.*33.
k *Hab.*1.5.

I. If he were the same man, yet might hee liue as long as Daniel. Also you know how long Isaiah, and Hosea prophecied; namely, at the least sixtie three yeares.

CHAP. III.

Of Wisdome: Ecclesiasticus, and Baruch.

N. FRom the *Historicall Books* I passe to those *Apocryphall Volumes*, which are tearmed *Sapientall*; whereof the *Booke* of *Wisdome* (commonly ascribed to *Philo* the *Iew*;) and *Ecclesiasticus* (compiled by *Iesus* the *Sonne* of *Syrach*) may be called *Dogmaticall*; and the *last* (namely, the *Booke* of *Baruch*) *Prophetical*.

I. Whither Philo penned the Booke of Wisdome wee dispute not: But at this wee marueil, that Doctor Iunius (being a man of rare diligence) could espie no errour in the Bookes of Wisdome or Baruch; and yet your Eagle eyes haue found some of this kinde.

N. First, wee blame the *title*, then the *matter* of the *Booke* of *Wisdome*. The title seemeth to

make *Salomon*, the *Author* thereof, which is false, without all controuersie.

1. **It is not intended by** this title, **that this** Booke **should bee ascribed to** Salomon; **but it is only propounded**, as a Meditation or Soliloquie **made in imitation of that** diuine Wisdome **of** Salomon, **published in his Bookes of the** Prouerbes, **the** Preacher, **and the** Canticles: **Of which kinde were the Meditations of Saint** Augustine, Bernard, Anselme, **and** [a] others.

a μιμητικὰ ποιήματα.

N. In the *matter* of the *Booke* wee dislike *two places*: First, those [b] wordes: *Bi trather being good, I came into an vndefiled bodie*: wherein *two errours* are contained: First, that the *soule is created before the bodie*: Secondly, that according to the *merit*, or *demerit* thereof, it obtaineth a *good* or *bad bodie*: which be the *errours* of *Plato*, the *Chiliasts*, and *Origen*: Other *plaine meaning* of this *place* cannot be framed.

b *Wisdome* 8.20.

1. **If you reiect the** Booke, **because some place therein is not plaine; what shall be done to the** Epistles **of Saint** Paul; **wherein** some things are [c] hard to be vnderstood? **Nay, what shall become of the** Bookes **of** Iob, Canticles, Ezekiel, Daniel, **and the** Apocalips? **(not to speake of** Tertullian, Possidonius, Thucidides, Suetonius, Aristotle, Archimidedes, Lycophron, **and** Persius; **which Bookes** all **will acknowledge to be as hard as profitable.) Furthermore** two gentler interpretations **may bee brought**

c 2. *Pet.* 3. 16.

brought of this place: The first is [d] vulgar; namely thus: But I, becomming better, (that is, making progresse in [e] vertue) I came into a bodie vndefiled, that is, obtained a bodie, neither polluted with fornication, when I was young, nor with adulterie when I was married: howsoeuer according to the custome of the time I vsed Polygamie:) The second exposition is this, But rather being good (that is, in regard of my soule, which though it were not free from Originall sinne, yet was endued with as much strength of nature as may bee: namely, in respect of vnderstanding, memorie, or fancie) came into a bodie vndefiled (either with a too fierie, or too foggie a complexion whereby the operations of my soule might haue beene made ouer dull or precipitate.) If either of these two meanings bee admitted your two imputations will vanish: Lastly, your latter errour, which you pretend, hath no ground; For he saith not because I was good; but, being good, I came into a bodie vndefiled; shewing, not the cause, but the concurrent condition of the soule, when it obtained a good bodie. Neither indeed is your former aspersion very probable: For though he say I came into the Bodie, it followeth not hereupon that the Soule was made before This rather may bee the meaning: My soule, being created and infused, came in an instant into the bodie.

N. In the *second place* wee mislike these words:

[d] *Lyranus* vpon this place.

[e] Μᾶλλον δὲ ἀγαθὸς ὢν.

words: f *When a father mourneth grieuously for his sonne, &c.* By which place is intimated, that the *first beginning of Idols* was the *custome* of the *mourning* for the *dead*: whereas wee reade of *Idols* long before, namely, in the dayes of *Rahel*; yea of *Abraham* and g *Terah.*

f *Wisdome* 14. 14. & 15.

g *Gen.*31.19. & 53. *Ios* 24 2. See *Calvin Instit. Lib.*1. *chap.* 11. *Sect.*8.

I. First, the Author maketh this only the occasion of the publique adoration of Idols; by the commandement of Tyrants: What is this to Rahel or Abraham; which (for ought you can produce) had only their priuate wil-worships? But tell mee (I pray you) what was Tammuz for whom the women mourned in the h Prophet?

h *Ezek.*8.14.

N. Some thinke he was *Adonis*: Others say better, that he was *Osiris*, *King* of *Egypt*, and *husband* to *Isis*; who being slaine of his *Brother Typhon* was by her lamented, and deified.

I. At what time raigned Osiris in Egypt?

N. Surely he was a *most ancient King*. For *he*, with *his wife* instructed the *Egyptians* in the vse of *Wheate* and *Barley*: So that it may seeme hee was *before the time of Abraham*, who went into *Egypt*, when there was a *famine* in *Canaan*, which he had not done if the *vse of graine* had not beene there knowne.

I. You see then by all probabilitie, that the Idoll Tammuz, was before Abraham: and (it may bee also) before Terah. For was not Prometheus the sonne of Iapetus or Iapheth (the elder brother of Shem) which first framed

Idols,

Idols, much more ancient then Terah?

N. We insist not so much vpon the *Antiquitie* of *Idols*: Only we say that *man's minde*, desirous of a *visible God*, was rather the *originall cause* of them; then the *fashion* of the *lamenting* for the *dead*.

I. The Authour speakes not of the inward cause, but of the outward and publique occasion. Now you cannot proue that the Idolatrie of Rahel or Terah was not thus occasioned.

N. From the *Booke* of *Wisdome*, I come to the *Booke* of *Ecclesiasticus*: wherein we first mislike the *Argument*, and *Prologue*: then the *Treatise* it selfe.

I. The Argument is extant only in some Greeke Copies: Neither seemeth it to be compiled by the Authour of the Booke. Haue you not obserued that the subscriptions of Saint Raul's Epistles, haue beene blamed by Ancient Diuines, as things added by some vnskilfull Clarkes? And what if the same should fall out, euen in this Argument? But now declare the fault thereof.

N. These words seeme to be very [i] arrogant. This *Iesus* did *imitate Salomon*: and *was no lesse famous in wisdome and doctrine, &c.*

I. Why doe not you translate them as Iunius did, namely, thus: He was a follower of *Salomon*, no lesse endeauouring to proue wisdome and Learning? what is the scruple?

N. He seemeth to *equallize Iesus* to *Salomon*.

I.

[i] The argument of *Ecclesiasticus*, *verse* 8. according to *Iunius*.

I. **When wee say,** Let thy will bee done on earth as it is in heauen; **And** forgiue vs our trespasses, as we forgiue: **Also when** k Christ **saith,** You shall bee perfect as your father which is in heauen is perfect; **is it intended that we** should doe Gods will equally to the Angels? **Or that we** should pardon sinne or bee perfect in equalitie God?

k *Matth.* 5. 48.

N. These *phrases* doe not import a *iust equalitie*, but a *likenesse of proportion* according to the *degree*, and *measure* of our *weaknesse*.

I. **The same may be here affirmed: For as** Salomon **by his** infused gifts **did search out** wisdome; **so** Iesus (**no doubt**) **by his** purchased habits, **might tread the same steps, though** in an vnlike degree; **and bee as famous in his** time **and** kinde, **as** Salomon **was in** his.

N. In the *Prologue*, these words declare the *spirit* of the *Authour* to bee *nothing* l *propheticall: And to this, take it in good worth, though wee seeme to some in some things not able to attaine to the interpretation of such words as are hard to bee expressed: For the things that are spoken in the Hebrew tongue, haue an other force in themselues, then when they are translated into an other tongue, &c.* Furthermore, the first words, *take in good worth*, are in the m *Greeke*: to *haue*, or *giue pardon*: A phrase nothing befitting the *maiestie* of *God's Spirit*.

l In the Prologue of *Ecclesiasticus*, *verses* 6 & 7. according to *Iunius*.

m συγγνώμην ἔχειν.

I. **First, the** Greeke word **may** signifie **some thing else then** pardon **or** remission: **Saint**

Paul

Paul vseth it for [n] Permission: Besides, it is a strange phrase in Greeke, to haue pardon for to giue pardon. The simple meaning of the place is, to permit willingly, or beneuolently: or take in good worth, as wee translate it: Secondly, he saith, not if we be vnable: but if wee seeme to be vnable: Thirdly, he maketh a translation to be inferiour to the originall; and the Greeke to the Hebrew. The former is plaine by daily experience: The latter may be thus explained: First, the Greeke tongue came by the confusion at Babel: whereas the Hebrew was more ancient and diuine: Secondly, the Hebrew roots are verbs, and those few, and are easily found by certaine Letters; whereas the Greeke Theames are variable, infinite, intricate: Thirdly, whatsoeuer the Greeke doth adde to, or take from the Hebrew, proceedeth from imperfection: as namely, the adding of the neuter gender, and of cases; as also of indefinite tenses, is a thing most needlesse. So the taking away of genders out of verbes, and the future tense out of the Imperatiue Moode (which only should haue beene therein:) as also of the fiue last formes of Coniugations (wherein the Arabians were imitated) doth argue great confusion: Fourthly, if this Prologue were penned by the Authour, and your argument were in full force, the Booke were only excluded the Canon, but not out of the Church, wherein we defend that Apocryphall Bookes

n 1. Cor. 7. 6.

Bookes **may be read for** morall vse: **Fiftly, to what end is this** allegation, **seeing we reade neither** the argument **nor the** Prologue **in the** Church?

N. In the *Treatise* wee disallow *foure things*; whereof *the first* concernes *Christ*: the *other three*, his seruants the *Prophets*. Christ (*the wisdome of the Father*) is said to bee [o] *created*; which is little lesse then *Arrianisme*.

o *Eccles.* 1.4. & 9. & 24.12.

I. **First, some** doubt **not to affirme** these places **to bee meant of** God's wisdome shewed in his creatures, **and not of** Christ: **Secondly, this** [p] **word may signifie not only** to be created, **but to bee** possessed: **for so the** Septuagint **doe render it in the** [q] Prouerbs.

p ἔκτισε.

q *Prou.* 8.22.

N. The place was corrupted by the *Arrians*, who reade ἔκτισε for ἔκτησε: for so it should haue beene read according to the *Hebrew*.

I. **There is no such** Greeke word **as** ἔκτησε: **but** ἐκτήσατο: **for it is a** Verbe meane, **and not** actiue. **Againe, the word** κτίσαι signifieth to inhabit, or possesse, **whereupon** κτίστης **doth signifie not only the** builder **of a** Citie: **but also the** inhabitant **therein, and** Possessor **thereof: Thirdly, to** create, **may** signifie to ordaine, **as when we say a** King **is** created, **that is** ordained. **Now what** hindereth vs to say **that** Christ **from the** beginning **was** possessed; **and in a sort** [r] **ordained by his** Father?

r *Rom.* 1.3.

N. From *Christ* I descend to the *Prophets*; whereof the *first*, namely, *Enoch*, was before the

Flood:

Floud: the *other two*, that is *Samuel* and *Elias* did succeed it. [f] *Enoch* is said to be *taken away for an example of repentance to the generations:* whereupon the *Papists* haue fained *Enoch* to be one of the *two witnesses* in the *Apocalyps*, which should fight against *Antichrist*. [t]

f *Eccles.* 44.16.

t *Apoc* 11.3.

I. The Papists can euince no such thing out of this place: For it is only said, that hee was remoued from the power of wicked men; that they knowing what hee had [u] prophecied concerning the Floud to bee brought vpon the World for sinne, and considering his triumphant passage into heauen, might repent. So Christ [x] saith: That the Spirit should conuince the World of sinne, because they beleeued not in him: and of the righteousnesse of his cause for that he whom they had crucified, was taken vp to his Father in Heauen. As for the witnesses of Saint Iohn, (if any place be for coniecture) it is more probable by the consideration of the miracles there mentioned, that the first of them was Moses, and not Enoch.

u *Iude* 14,15.

x *Iohn* 16.8. & 11.

N. Next to *Enoch* is *Samuel*, who is said to *haue* [y] *foreshewed the Kings death:* whereas indeed that *foreteller*, was not *Samuel* but *Satan*.

y *Eccles.* 46.20.

I. But the Scripture calleth him [z] Samuel.

z 1. *Sam.* 28. 15,16.20.

N. Not because he was so indeed, but in *appearance*.

I. Why then may not the Sonne of Sirach vse the same Phrase?

N. Yea, but hee reckoneth this amongst *Sa-*

muels praises; which was *one of the prizes of the Deuill.*

I. **It was a praise to** Samuel **that** Saul **who would not beleeue** Samuel **during his life, was forsaken by** God, **and so deliuered vp to a** reprobate sense; **that hee sought helpe from** Satan **appearing in his** likenesse, **whose** prophecies **he had abused and contemned.**

N. From *Samuel* the *Iudge* wee passe to *Elias*, vnder the Kings; who (as the [a] Authour saith) *is appointed in due season to turne the hearts of the fathers to their children:* Wherein I note first a *contradiction:* then a *false interpretation.* The *former* thus appeares? These wordes (as you know) are alledged out of [b] *Malachie* who was the last of all the *Prophets.* Now it is said in the [c] *argument*, that *Iesus* was after all the *Prophets* almost.

a *Eccles.* 41.10.

b *Mal.* 4.5,6.

c The argument of *Ecclesiasticus, verse* 2 according to *Iunius.*

I. Iesus the father of Sirach **might be before** Malachie, **and yet** Iesus **the** Sonne **of** Sirach **might succeed him in time. This** latter Iesus **finished the** Volume: **Againe** Malachie, **was the** last Prophet **whose writings are extant: and yet some** Prophet **might come after him: For** Elias **and** Elisha **wrote** nothing: **and yet were** Prophets **of the** best ranke: **So that** Malachie **might bee alleadged by the** Sonne of Sirach **and yet he liued to see some other** Prophet, **later then** Malachie: **Lastly, he is said to** haue liued after all the the Prophets almost: **whereby it may bee thought: that hee might see**

Ma-

Malachie, and yet not suruiue him.

N. The *false interpretation* is this: That the *Authour* doth suppose the *bodily returne* of the *Old Elias* into the *world*, before the *Day of Iudgement*: whereas both [c] *Christ*, and the [d] *Angel*, expound it of *Iohn the Baptist*: So that it may seeme the *Iewish* and *Popish*, fabulous *Elias* had hence their beginning.

c *Math.* 11.14.
d *Luke* 1.17.

I. The Iewes reiect this Booke as much as you doe. The Papists for their dreame doe as well alledge Malachie as this Authour: Yea, they doubt not to peruert the words of Christ, thus reading them: This is *Elias* that is to come; whereas they should be read thus that was to come: as is plaine by the thirteenth verse: and by the words of the Angell in S. Luke: As for the meaning of this Authour it may be thus: Elias the Thisbite was a man of that excellent spirit, that Iohn the fore-runner of Christ; and greater then all the Prophets, should bee called by his name, and bee said to come in his spirit and power: As the two witnesses in Saint [e] Iohn are said to be reuiued in their Successours; and inspired with their spirit: It may bee also thus meant, that Elias in his owne time, and person performed these things.

e *Apoc* 11.11. Compare *Ecclesiasticus* 48. 11. with the Kings Maiesties diuine speech and answere in the conference at *Hampton* Court.

N. It resteth now: That we come to *Baruch*, which hath two parts: First, a *Prophesie* in *fiue Chapters*: Secondly, the *Epistle of Ieremie* in the *sixt*. In the *Prophesie* we mislike *two places*: First, these

these [f] words: In the *fift yeare*, the *seuenth day of the moneth*: whereby is intimated that *Ierusalem* was *taken* and *burnt* in the *fift yeare* of *Zedechias*; whereas it is plaine by the *Storie* [g] of the *Kings*, and by [h] *Ieremie*, that this fell not out till the *eleuenth yeare* of the same *King*.

f *Baruch* 1.2.

g 2. *Kings* 25.2.
h *Ier.* 52 6.

I. **We reade not** Baruch **for** Chronologie, **but for** Moralitie: **If you were bound to reconcile** all the calculations of times in Scriptures, **you should haue need of** the helpe **of the tenth** [i] Muse. **Yea** (I beleeue) **if** ten Scaligers **should concurre, they could not cut all the** Gordian knots **made by** Chronologers. **For** this particular time, Iunius **guesseth that the** Citie **might be set on** fire, **in the** fift yeare, **and yet the flame being extinguished**, the last burning of Ierusalem **might bee deferred till the** eleuenth. **Another** coniecture **may be this: that the** fift yeare **is put for the** fift moneth, **that is, of the** eleuenth yeare. **For in the** fourth moneth **of the** eleuenth yeare **was the** Citie [k] taken: **and in the** fift moneth **of the** same yeare **came** Nabuzaradan **who burnt the** [l] Citie: **For it may seeme strange that** Baruch **should** set **down the** yeare **and** day, **but not the** moneth.

i This name was giuen to *Ioseph Scaliger* for his skill in this, and other arts & tongues.

k *Jer* 52.6.

l 2 *Kings* 25.8.

N. As strange as you make it, it is vsed in the *Storie* of the [m] *Kings*: where it is said, *and the ninth day of the moneth the famine was sore*, no *number* of the *moneth* being expressed.

m 2. *Kings* 25 3

I. **But** Ieremie **resolues, that this was the** fourth moneth; **which if hee had not done,**

we

we ſhould neuer haue vnderſtood that place in the Kings: And ſome would haue coniectured by moneth, to be meant the firſt moneth; which, as you ſee, is refuted by Ieremie.

N. To leaue your *intricate Chronologie:* the *ſecond place* wee diſallow is in theſe [n] words: *Heare the dead Iſraelites:* where it ſeemeth the *Prayers* of the *Saints* in *Heauen* are allowed after the *Popiſh manner.*

n *Baruch* 3.4.

I. Where doe you reade that by dead Iſraelites are meant the Saints in Heauen.

N. Were not *Abraham, Iſaacke* and *Iacob,* now *dead?*

I. But Chriſt tels vs, that they are [o] liuing: For he is their God: But he is not the God of the dead but of the liuing.

o *Math.* 22.32.

N. Saint *Paul* ſaith, that hee is the God of the [p] *dead* alſo.

p *Rom.* 4.9.

I. Chriſt ſpeaketh of God in mercie, in regard of redemption: the Apoſtle treateth of God in power, in reſpect of creation, and moderation of things. But (tell mee) is it not an vnreuerend and vnproper phraſe to ſay that God heares the prayers of the dead Saints? (for it is confeſſed that the Saints in generall pray for vs.) The firſt is plaine; for it can be little then profane to call them dead which liue with God: The latter is euident: For ſeeing they pray as they are aliue, not as they are dead, it is but a rough-hewne ſpeech to tearme them the prayers of dead men: Beſides, two other in-

interpretations, may be brought: First, by dead Men may be meant, men dead in q sinnes: This is confirmed by the wordes following in the same verse, which haue sinned: Secondly, they may be said to be dead, in regard of their infinite troubles: and so they are said to bee defiled r with the dead. To the same purpose is the vision of the bones shewed to the s Prophet.

q *Matth.* 8. 22. *Ephes.* 2. 1.

r *Baruch* 3. 11.

s *Ezek.* 37. 1.

N. But how doth it appeare, that here are not meant *dead men*, whole *soules* are out of their bodies.

I. Baruch directly t denies, that such men pray: for so Iunius expounds it.

t *Baruch* 2. 17.

N. In the *Epistle* of *Ieremie*, we allow neither the *title* nor the *treatise*. The *title* seemeth to make *Ieremie* the *Authour* of this *Epistle*: which we finde not in *his prophesie*.

I. Your negatiue argument is an old Pigmies bul-rush against the Craines (as it is in the Fable.) But we pray you coniecture with Iunius that Ieremy sent this Epistle by u Seraiah.

u *Ier.* 51. 59.

N. In the *Treatise* first we dislike these words x *seuen generations*, where a *generation* is taken for *ten yeares* against the vse of *Scripture phrase*.

x *Baruch* 6. 2.

I. It will be hard for you to binde Baruch to the calculations of Iubilies. If you doe, the answere will bee, that the Greeke Interpreter vsed the Greekish accompt: For example: Hee that translated Xiphilin into Latine, for the Greeke Drachma doth vse the Latine Denarius and aureus for twentie fiue y Drachmaes. So the

y *Drachma* or *denarius* is 7. *d.* *ob.* *aureus* 15 *s.* *d ob.*

the Greeke Expositor finding seuenty yeares in in the Hebrew expressed it by seuen generations which the Greekes call ἑπτὰ ἐτηπίδες; the Romans [z] tempora bilustria, that is, times of ten yeares. Wee in England would haue teamed them ten liues: that is, seuen yeares to a life.

z *Pergama quum caderent bello superata bilustri.*

N. Secondly we cannot indure your *immoderate prayses* of *this Chapter.* For you haue publiquely taught, That it is *more able* to conuince the *Papists* of *Idolatrie*, then the *Canonicall text.*

I. This was said, not because it was equall with the Canon; but, first, because they haue added it to the Canon, and yet it crosseth their Idolatrie: For whatsoeuer arguments are here brought against the Idols of Pagans, the same may be alleadged against Popish Images: Secondly, because this Chapter is a compendious collection of those things which are largely propounded in Scriptures. And thus your arguments against the reading of the Apocryphall Bookes in the Church are become like a white cloud without raine: or like an Eunuch embracing * a Virgin.

* *Ecclesiasticus* 20.3. & 30.20.

CHAP.

Chap. IV.

Of the Tranſlation of the Pſalmes.

N. FRom the *Bookes Apocryphall* I aſcend to the *vndoubted Canon:* conſiſting of *Pſalmes*, and *Chapters*. Firſt, of the *Pſalmes*, as being wholy ſet downe in your *Liturgie*. We ſay that you haue deformed them both in *quantitie* and *qualitie*: Concerning *quantitie*, you haue *detracted*, and *added:* You haue *detracted ſentences* and *words:* Of the *firſt kind* are the *titles* of the *Pſalmes*, which you haue omitted.

I Declare I pray you the number and kinds of thoſe titles.

N. Twentie and fiue Pſalmes haue *no title* at all: Now of thoſe, which haue *titles annexed*, about *fortie two* haue *diſtinct titles*, ſhewing their *cauſe outward* or *inward:* The *outward*, is the *end*, or *efficient. Titles* declaring the *end* are ſuch as theſe: *A Prayer of Dauid*; A Pſalme of prayſe; for remembrance; or of Inſtruction. Whereby it appeareth that ſome *Pſalmes* are *Petitions*, ſome *Thankeſgiuings* (which are *two kinds of Prayer:*) Others bee *Inſtructions:* The titles ſhewing the *Efficient*, are theſe: *A Pſalme of Dauid*; To *Ieduthun*;

duthun; To *Asaph*, *&c.* whereby the *Penman* or *Singer* is described: The *inward cause* is the *matter* or *forme*. The *matter* is expressed in the *titles*, setting downe the occasion of the *Psalme* (as in *Psalmes* 3.7.18. &c.) The *outward forme* is seene in those *titles*, which describe the *Musicall keyes* to bee vsed in *song* (as in *Psalme*, *fourth*, *ninth*, and *others*.)

I. To speake in order of these tittles: I say three things. First, I probably thinke that they were not compiled by the Authours of the Psalmes: Secondly, that they be not needfull: Thirdly, that they are imperfect. The first I thus explaine: First, it is not likely that Dauid would haue set downe the foureteenth, and fiftie third Psalmes; forasmuch as they differ scarcely in three words, excepting the titles which are so different, that they seeme not to come from the same Authour. The like is to be thought of the forty third Psalme, which hath no title, and yet is an epitomie of the fortie second Psalme, whose title is most large: Secondly, we find the hundred and eight Psalme compiled of two other Psalmes, (namely, the fiftie seuenth Verse seuenth to the end. And the sixtieth, Verse six, to the end) which argues, that Dauid neuer compiled these Psalmes in one Booke: And therefore the Hebrewes make foure Bookes of Psalmes: Thirdly, it is written in the end of the seuentie second Psalme, Here end the Prayers of Da-

uid the ſonne of Iſhai: which will hardly admit a good conſtruction, if wee thinke that Dauid ordered the Pſalmes, as now wee find them. For there are many Pſalmes after that aſcribed to Dauid (as moſt of the Songs of Degrees, and the like:) Secondly, that theſe titles are not needfull, may thus appeare: First, if Dauid were the Authour of the firſt ſeuentie two Pſalmes, what need is there in euery Pſalme to iterate theſe words a Pſalme of Dauid? Secondly, why ſhould not the title of the fiftie third Pſalme bee needfull for the fourteenth, containing the ſame matter? Thirdly, theſe titles can bee no more needfull then the Hebrew Letters ſet vpon the hundred and nineteenth Pſalme. Now theſe are vſefull to none but them which vnderſtand the Hebrew Tongue; whoſe memories may bee aided by them: Fourthly, the Muſicall titles cannot bee needfull, and that for a double reſpect: First, becauſe they are not vnderſtood as the Iewes themſelues confeſſe.

N. Learned men haue expounded them.

I. They haue made ſome flying coniectures concerning them: So that it is not meete with them to oppreſſe the capacities of the multitude; which receiue ſuch ſubtleties as theſe as the bottomleſſe barrell of the Belides did water. Secondly, theſe harmonious titles (at the leaſt in your opinion) are needleſſe for vs: For you account Church-muſique ceremoniall

niall; and almost, as vnprofitable as Pictures or Images.

N. The *titles* which declare the *occasions* of the *Psalmes* cannot but be very *profitable*.

I. Some of them are verie obscure, and of little vse to the people without an Interpreter (as Psal. 7.) the rest are exceeding short; so that they may seeme to bee certaine briefe notes collected for the direction of the Priests onely: Thirdly, that these titles are imperfect, may be gathered thus; First, to what end is the title of the ninetie eight Psalme, which is thus nakedly set downe A Psalme?

N. It may be to distinguish it from a *Song*.

I. It will be Plato's yeare, before you find out this distinction: Secondly, there be many Psalmes of Prayer; Prayse; Instruction; and Remembrance: whereof some haue no titles: others no such thing expressed in their titles: and therefore your title to titles, is but a title of contention.

N. From Sentences I descend to *words*, by you *detracted*. Now these are words of *attention*, or *intention*: You haue taken away sundry words of *attention*: Namely first in the middest *Selah* [a] very often; *Higgaion* [b] once: Secondly, in the *end Haleluiah*, *seuenteene times*.

I. Tell mee (I pray you) what meane you by Selah?

N. Some thinke, it meaneth no more then *verie much*: Others suppose it to be a *Musicall note*,

a The first place is in *Psal.* 3. 2.
b *Psal* 9. 16.

whereby the *Quire* was admonished to *lift vp their voice.*

I. Your former interpretation is hungrie, cold, naked; the latter (at least according to your fancie) is Ceremoniall, and so a stranger from our Church: The truth is, this tearme Selah is most obscure: The like may be said of Higgaion (howsoeuer some expound it, a thing to be meditated of with industrie:) As for Haleluiah I answered when I spake of Gloria Patri.

N. Besides *words* of *attention*; you haue also taken away *effectuall words* of *intention*: So that you haue corrupted the *sense*, as the *dead Frogs* did the *Land of Egypt*. Of the *first kinde*, is that place in the [c] *Psalme*; *There is little Beniamin their ruler*: whereas it should be read *with their ruler.*

[c] *Psal* 68.27.

I. In the Hebrew text this word with is not to be found: In the seuentie Interpreters it is not extant: For they reade it thus. There is young Beniamin in excellencie; the Princes of Iuda, &c.

Mentis excessu.

N. The *Greeke word* is there ἐν ἐκστάσει: which is to be translated *phrenzie.*

I. You will sooner fall into a phrenzie, then make this a good construction of that place.

N. If these wordes bee not corrupted: by *phrenzie* may bee meant a *Propheticall extasie* whereby *Beniamin* was moued *to praise God in hymnes.*

I. The Greeke word may come of ἐξισασθαι, to bee eminent, or stand aboue others: And so we may accord it with the Hebrew veritie: and so not stand in need of your wresting. Besides Iunius translates it as wee doe: Lastly, the sense agrees with vs little *Beniamin* their ruler, in regard of Saul of that Tribe, the first King: Or in respect of the Temple, standing in that part of Ierusalem which pertained to the Tribe of [d] Beniamin.

d *Deut.* 33.12.

N. The *second place* is in these *words : they were not* [e] *obedient :* whereas it should bee read *they were not disobedient.*

e *Psal.*105.28.

I. What if it were the slip of the Printer to omit the syllable dis, or to insert the syllable not; could you not haue lent him a Spiders web; or an Egyptian Canopie to catch Syllables instead of flies?

N. You know that *Sibboleth* being pronounced for [f] *Shibboleth*, was an *instrument* of a *great slaughter :* And that *Arrius* differed from the *Church* but in a *letter*; saying, that *Christ* was ὁμοιούσιος, that is, *like to God in substance :* whereas the *Church* said he was ὁμοούσιος; that is, *coessentiall, or consubstantiall with God.* Againe, we are not bound to subscribe to the *errours of the Printers.*

f *Judges* 12.6.

I. Belike then you will not subscribe to any Hebrew Bible in the world forasmuch as none will be found, wherein there is no addition, detraction or alteration of a Syllable. Now whereas

whereas you pretend that the change of a letter or syllable may doe much hurt: that imputation cannot agree to this place, whether we consider the reading or sense. For the first you know that the word לא which here both you and we translate not, may be rendred him: as if it were written לו For the like change we finde in the g Kings; according to the generall exposition. Againe, these words may be read with an interrogation, thus; were they not disobedient? And so it will be alone with this they were not obedient: The like is in h Iob: Lastly, the Seuentie read it thus; because they sharpned his words (or decres) namely by their disobedience. Now we know that the Apostles did many times follow rather the Seuentie then the Hebrew.

g 2. *King.* 8.10.

h *Iob* 13.15.

N. That was done, because the *Greeke Translation* was better vnderstood, then the *Hebrew*: Besides the *True Translation* of the Seuentie is lost.

I. Not lost; but in part altered: For wee finde the Apostles citing sundrie places, according to the Translation now extant.

N. You striue about the *reading*, like a *beare* in a *net*: but you cannot make the *sense* accord: The plaine *meaning* is, that *Moses* and *Aaron*, the *wonder-workers*; or rather *the wondrous plagues* themselues, were not *disobedient* to his *words* and *decrees*.

I. If our reading may be admitted, the meaning,

ning **may bee thus as plaine**: that the *Ægyptians* obeyed not God's Word, for all the plagues: **And this will agree well with the** [i] Storie.

i *Exod* 9.3. See it in the Hebrew.

N. As you haue *detracted*, so you haue *added sentences* and *words*: For the *former*: First, you haue added *three whole verses* to one [k] *Psalme*.

k *Psal.*14 after *verse* 4.

I. **We did it, according to the** citation **of this place, vsed by Saint** Paul **to the** [l] Romans.

l *Rom.*3.13 to the 19.

N. You thought that hee had cited all these words out of this *Psalme*; whereas indeed they are taken out of sundrie places of the *Psalmes*, *Proverbes*, and *Isaiah*: Or else how durst you to haue added them to the *Psalmes* in your *Liturgie*?

I. **Saint** Paul **had ioyned them together in** citation: **and therefore wee thought it no** hainous errour **to conioyne them in reading the Psalmes: Considering hereby, that both the fourteenth** Psalme, **and the third to the** Romanes, **doe receiue a** mutuall light of explanation: **Neither can** any errour **hereby arise: If the** references **bee well set in the** Booke: **For it is well obserued, that the** English references, **are better for vse, then most of your** Geneuian notes **whereof some haue beene taxed of** [m] partialitie.

m As that vpon *Exod.*1. 19. and vpon the 2.*Chron.*15. 16. See the Conference at *Hampton* Court.

N. In the *second place* you haue added a *verse*, to the 136. *Psalme*: which is not in the *Hebrew* nor in the *Greeke*: but seemeth rather to bee taken

ken out of the *Vulgar Latine*.

I. **Haue you not heard** men **in the end of a Psalme sing the** last verse **of the twentie eight Psalme?**

N. I haue heard *Some of your owne brethren do it*: neither may I disallow it: Considering it may bee vsed as a good *Epiphonematicall conclusion* to a *Psalme*.

I. **The like may be said of** this verse: Prayse yee the Lord of Lords, &c. **which is repeated out of the** third verse **of the same Psalme: and therefore cannot be** erroneous; **but may bee a good** Epiphonema **or** conclusion **to the** Psalme. **Now if you feare it will spoile the** Rabbinicall conceit **of the** number **of** six and twentie; **containing** the two and twentie Hebrew Letters: **and the** foure letters of rest, **which are said to be found in the name** Iehouah; **wee passe not for such** bubbles **in the** water.

N. From *Sentences* I passe to a *Word* by you added in these words of the *Psalme*: For so you reade it, *that seeke thy* [n] *face, O Iacob.*

n *Psal.* 24.6.

I. **How are the** words **read in the** Hebrew?

N. Thus (as I take it:) *that seeke thy face Iacob.*

I. **How doe** the Seuentie **reade it?**

N. Thus: *that seeke the face of the God of Iacob.*

I. **And how would you** reade **or** translate them?

N. This is the generation of them that seeke

thy

thy face (this is) Iacob: that is; Iacob *is the generation which seeke Gods face:* whereas you make the *Iust to seeke the face of* Iacob; a sense either *idle*, or *idolatrous*.

I. To seeke the face of *Iacob* (that is, the Visible Church) is no idolatrie: for God's face, or Presence, is best seene in his Church. Thus our Translation agreeth in sense with the Greeke; in sense and words with the Hebrew: whereas yours iarreth in both, with both.

N. As you deformed the *quantitie:* so haue you altered the *qualitie* of the *Psalmes* by *obscuritie*, and *falshood:* The *obscuritie* appeares both in the *connexion* of *whole sentences:* and in perverting of *some words:* Of the *first kinde* is that in the [o] *Psalme:* where thus you reade: *Or euer your pots be made hote with thornes, so let indignation vexe him, euen as a thing that is raw.* Here I would aske vpon what *ground* or *colour* you haue translated *Pots?*

o *Psal.* 58 8. or 9. according to some.

I. Do not you know that the Hebrew word signifieth both *Pots*, and *Thornes?* Now tell me, how you would haue this place translated.

N. Our brethren of Geneua, haue thus rendred them; *As rawe flesh before the pots feele the fire of thornes; so let him carrie him away as with a whirle-wind, in his wrath.*

I. This is as obscure as the former: Besides you see that your brethren translate pots aswell as wee. And here I might aske you how they came to render it thus, as it were in his wrath.

N. The Seuentie so translate it; and the *Hebrew word* is so taken in *another* P *Psalme.*

P *Psal.* 78. 49.

I. **True, if you reade it** without points: **And it may bee that you suppose that** points **were inuented by the** Masorites, **which were much later then the** Seuentie.

N. I will not enter into *that question:* But I reuerence *the points* of the *Masorites*, aboue the *Seuentie* now extant.

I. **That this** plea **may be brought to an** issue; **Produce I pray you some** plaine interpretation **of this** place.

N. The *place* may be rendred to this effect: *Before they vnderstand (that is before men perceiue by miserable experience and feeling) your prickles (which are as the prickles) of rhamnus (that is a poysoned bramble) hee (that is God) shall with a whirle-winde destroy it:* (namely, the *bramble*, or *euerie one of the prickles*) *as well as the liuing* (that is the *greene* and *flourishing prickle*) as the *dried* (for the *bramble* hath some *prickles greene*, some *dry*, and *withered* at the same time) This is the *plainest exposition* that I can inuent.

I. **Then were you mistaken in accusing our** Liturgie **of** obscuritie: **For** your interpretation **will hardly euer be vnderstood of the** vulgar. **And indeed it were an** vnreasonable taske, **to force them to conceiue the** connexion **of** euerie intricate place **in** Iob, Psalmes, Ecclesiastes, **and the** Prophets: Considering that the best learned, **doe many times here** stand amazed

like

like the ten Spies, when they saw the wals, and stature of the Anakims.

N. From the *connexion of sentences*, I turne my selfe to your peruerting of *words:* wherein your *ignorance* discouers it selfe: sometimes putting in a word that is *opposite:* sometimes that is *diuers.* An *example* of the *first kind* is this: ¶ *Because of mens workes that are done against the words of my lips, I haue kept, &c.* Whereas the words should thus bee turned, *concerning the workes of men, by the words of thy lips, I kept mee, &c.* Here first you see that the *words* are by you mispointed: For this *clause: (By the words of thy lips)* should be ioyned to this *(I haue kept mee.)* Secondly, you haue translated *against* for *by*; and *my* for *thy*, which are *tearmes* plainly opposite. ¶ *Psal.17.4.*

I. The originall is pointed like our Booke, as is to be seene: As for the word which wee translate against; and you by, it hath both significations.

N. But in this place, it should be translated *by*; and not *against:* For *the Prophet* meaneth, that by the *words of Gods lips*; he had preserued himselfe from the wayes of the *cruell.*

I. The Hebrew pointing, refutes your meaning. The words may be thus expounded, Because men haue done things against the words of my lips; I haue therefore auoided their paths.

N. But the *Hebrew* hath *thy*, not my *lips.*

I. The sense is all one: For things done against God's word, were also wrought against

the words of Dauid, his true Prophet. So r Micha saith, Thou *Bethlehem* art little; meaning in regard of place; and yet Saint Matthew, citing the same s sentence, thus translates it; Thou *Bethlehem* art not little: Namely, because Christ should come out of that Citie. Thus the words differ; but the sense agrees.

r *Mich.5.2.*

s *Math.2.6.*

N. From *words opposite* I come to those which be *diuers*: and breed *obscuritie*. The *first example* of *this kind* is in the t *Psalme*; where you reade *humbly bringing pieces of siluer*: for *treading downe pieces of siluer*.

t *Psal.68.30.*

I. Your translation is more obscure then ours: and lesse agreeable to the Hebrew.

N. You know, that this word is so taken elsewhere: u howsoeuer in the *two former places* the word may seeme to varie in *writing*; and the *last* be written in *Chaldie*, not in *Hebrew*.

u *Prou.25.26. Ezek.32.2. Dan.7.7.*

I. These places are impertinent: for though they come of the same root: yet are they in a different forme of x Coniugation. For the word here betokeneth the action of a man treading downe himselfe; or craftily suffering himselfe to be trodden downe; that is, humbling himselfe: And so our interpretation is more consonant to the text, then yours. The Greeke is also for vs: for so it is there found: that they which are tried may be bowed downe with siluer, that is, may humble themselues, bringing pieces of siluer: For (as I take it) the words are amisse altered in the y Greeke.

x They are in *Cal*, and *Niphal*. This in *Hithpael*.

y ἐγκλισθῶσι for ἐγκλισθῶσι

N. The *second instance* of your *mistaking* is,

when you reade in the [z] *Pſalme : It ſhall not breake my head*; as if it were meant of the *flatteries* of *wicked men:* Whereas it ſhould bee thus rendred: *Let it not be wanting to my head:* being to be expounded, of the *reproofe* of the *godly.*

z Pſal.141.5.

I. **Your** Geneuians **tranſlate it as we doe: and ſurely this tranſlation came from the** Greeke: **which is thus,** Let not the oyle of the ſinner anoint my head: **And (if you obſerue it well) the** ſenſe **will accord with the** Hebrew. **For when** Dauid **prayeth, that the** oyle **(namely of the** godly) **may** not be wanting to his head; **Doth hee not** by conſequence **requeſt** that the oyle of the wicked may not anoint it?

N. But how doth *breaking the head*, agree with *anointing?*

I. **Either this may be the meaning**; Let not the oyle of the wicked (**vnder pretence of** anointing) breake my head: **Or elſe, it may bee taken from the** cuſtome **of breaking** the box of ointment **ouer the** head **of** the partie * anointed.

* *Marke* 14.3.

N. From your *obſcuritie*, I proceed to your *falſhood:* wherein you violate either the *analogie* of *faith*; or of the *place*; and *preſent text.*

I. **When wee vrge you to** ſubſcribe **to the** tranſlation, **our** meaning **is: that** that there is no errour therein againſt the analogie of faith: **and you impertinently alledge** certaine errours **againſt the** analogie of **the** Place: **But now to your** prooſes.

N. The *firſt inſtance* of the *former kinde* is:

when

when you reade in the [z] *Psalme: Thou shalt learne frowardnesse:* Whereas it should be read; *Thou shalt shew thy selfe froward:* else the *speech* were *blasphemous.*

z *Psal.* 18.26.

I. The Hebrew word signifieth a reflexiue imitation, or learning of an action (as the Coniugation sheweth;) For in an other forme it signifieth to wrestle, or [a] striue: And it is a vulgar [b] figure, whereby we ascribe to God, the passions of men: (As when he is said to repent, to be grieued, or angry:) For indeed what can we conceiue, or vtter of God, without a figure? Againe, the [c] Greeke readeth as we doe: So that your censure of blasphemie, is somewhat too viperous.

a Namely in *Niphal. Gen* 30.8.

b ἀνθρωποπαθεία.

c διασρέψεις.

N. A *second instance* of the same fashion, is, when you reade in the [d] *Psalme*; *Shall not fall*; whereas it should be translated *shall not rest:* Else we should pray with some *ignorant people* to bee *deliuered from all euill.*

d *Psal.* 125.3.

I. The Seuentie render it as we [e] doe: And this is but a criticall cauill, about the emphasis of a word: For whatsoeuer doth rest vpon a thing, must first fall thereupon. So that by falling, wee meane an heauie, and a continued fall.

e ἐκ ἀφήσει, *Non dimittet.*

N. Against the *analogie* of the *place*, you haue corrupted *sentences* and *words:* An example of the *first* is, when you read in the [f] *Psalme*; *Though he suffer them to be euill intreated through tyrants*; whereas according to the *Hebrew* and *Greeke*,

f *Psal.* 107.40.

it

it is! *He powred out contempt*; Or *contempt is powred out vpon Princes.*

I. The meaning is all one: For God by sending forraine Tyrants to vilifie their Princes, doth suffer euen the People also to bee roughly handled by them. So Nabuchadnezar by God's permission pluckt out the eyes of Zedechias, and withall did leade the People into captiuitie.

N. You haue also corrupted and falsified *words*; two *Nounes*, and two *Verbes.*

I. O vnhappie Mother Church: which hast brought forth such children, as for a paire of Nounes and Verbes, make such long furrowes vpon thy backe.

N. To leaue *your Rhetorique:* The first place is in the g *Psalme:* where you reade *men of one minde*, for *solitarie men*,

g *Psal.* 68. 6.

I. We read it according to the h Greeke. The Hebrew word commeth of a root, signifying to Vnite. And surely it is a great blessing of God to haue an agreement in a Family.

h Μονοτρόπους.

N. The *next* i *place* is where you translate *a Congregation*, for a *fit time.*

i *Psal.* 75. 3. or 2. according to others.

I. The Hebrew word signifieth a Congregation k elsewhere. Dauid also meaneth that great Congregation mentioned in l Samuel: Lastly this was a fit time (namely in this assembly) to doe this action: and therefore the Greekes translate it a m season.

k *Numb.* 16. 2.
l 2. *Sam.* 3. 19. & 5. 1.

m καιρὸν.

N. The first falsified n *Verbe* is, where you render

n *Psal.* 106. 30.

render it *Phinees prayed*, for *executed iudgement*.

I. The Hebrew in other places: doth signifie to o pray. The Greekes also translate it as we p doe, intimating a prayer conioyned to his valiant act: by both which, he wrought the attonement.

o 1. *Sam.* 2. 1. & 25. *Ionah* 2. 1.

p ἐξιλάσατο.)

N. But where doe you reade in the *Storie* of *Phinees* that he *prayed?*

I. Where finde you in Exodus that Moses said, I feare and quake?

N. Though it bee not extant in *Moses*: yet we find it in the *Epistle* to the q *Hebrewes*, which is to vs *most authenticall*.

q *Heb.* 12. 21.

I. In like manner; Though Phinee's praier be not found in Moses: yet dare wee not denie credit to Dauid, reporting the same.

N. Your *last* r *corruption* is, where you interpret thus: *make me delight in good*; whereas it should be, *answer for me in that is good:* Or bee *my suretie in the thing which is good.*

r *Psal.* 119. 122

I. This Cobweb is not worth the sweeping downe: For who conceiueth not that God causeth vs to delight in goodnesse, when he becommeth our sure suretie for our good? And thus your twentie obiections against the Psalmes, are become like the apples of Sodome, turned into smoke, ashes, and brimstone.

CHAP.

Chap. V.

Of the Leſſons, Epiſtles, and Goſpels.

N. FRom the *Pſalmes*, I proceed to the *Chapters*; wherein we blame *your reading* and *Tranſlation*: In your *reading*, we diſallow your *omiſſion* of ſo many Chapters (Namely about *two hundred and ten*) So that of 1039. Chapters, you reade but 829.

I. The cauſe of our action is double: First, ſundry Chapters be exceeding hard, and therefore not fit to be read without [a] interpretation.

a 1. *Cor.* 14. 28.

N. This place hath beene fitly applied by *ſome of our brethren*, againſt *reading in the Church*, where there is no *preaching*.

I. Digreſſe not now: You know the place is meant of the interpretation of tongues, and not of preaching. But to let your opinion goe currant now, if no Chapters may be read without an Interpreter; How much more ſhould thoſe be unread which be intricate? and ſuch only: are by vs omitted. These are of foure kinds: First, ſome containe Genealogies, as Gen. 10. 11, 36 Exod. 6. Likewiſe the firſt of Matthew, and the third of Luke, in [b] part.

b *Math.* 1. 1. to the 18. *Luke* 3. 23. to the end.

N. By this reason, you should omit the first of *Genesis*: which is nothing but a *Genealogie*.

I. That is vntrue: For besides the Doctrine of Originall sinne; and the taking away of [c] Enoch: the long liues and deaths of the eight Patriarches are declared: also the time of the Floud, and the Preseruation of the Church is made knowne: Secondly, some be Ceremoniall, (as Exod. 25. to the 32. and 35. to the end of the Booke: Leuit. 1. to the 18. Likewise 21. to the 26 also the last Chapter of the same Booke: The like is to be said of sundry Chapters in Numbers: and those two in Deuteronomie: the 14. and 23.) Thirdly, some containe the description of places: (as Iosh. 15. to the 23.) Fourthly, some are Prophetically mysticall: (as all the Song of Salomon, and many Chapters in Ezekiel, especially the nine last: And Apocal. 2. to the 22.) The second cause of our action is; For that some Chapters doe onely repeate things else-where deliuered. Of this kind, are the Bookes of the Chronicles, and the seuenth of Nehemiah.

[c] Gen. 5. 3.

N. But why doe you omit the eighteenth of *Iob*?

I. I haue shewed you else-where: That those Chapters vttered by the three friends of Iob containe an [d] errour: and therefore if none of them were read without an Interpreter, it were more safe for the people. Of this number is this Chapter vttered by Bildad: What other par-

[d] *Chap.* 1. of the first booke.

particular reaſon, **may be rendred thereof, I am ignorant.**

N. But why doe you not reade the thirtieth of the *Prouerbs?*

I. **The** Chapter **is** very loftie, **and** obſcure: **and therefore an** eaſier Leſſon **were fitter for the** people.

N. This tearme of *Leſſon* is *Childiſh.*

I. **It is but the** Engliſh **of** Lection, **and** Lecture: **a word vſed by** [e] **Saint** Luke.

N. To leaue *your reading:* I proceed to your *tranſlation:* wherein *twentie* other *faults* are obſerued, aſwell as in your *Pſalmes:* Theſe alſo are in *quantitie*, and *qualitie:* In the *quantitie* (as before) *Subſtraction* and *Addition.*

I. **The** aduerſaries of Paul, **gaue him** one ſtripe leſſe **then** fortie: **You giue your** Mother **the** Church, **full** fortie ſtripes. **Beſides you are bad** Arithmeticians, **ſetting** Subſtraction **before** Addition: **But if, inſtead of** Subſtraction, **you had put** Detraction, **the** thing, **& the** name **had kept** time **together. Now declare what** materiall thing **haue we** taken away?

N. You haue cut of wordes *twice* in Saint *Luke*, and once in the *Epiſtle* to the *Coloſſians:* The *firſt place* in *Luke* is, where you reade, *this* [f] *is the ſixt moneth, which is called barren:* whereas it ſhould be, *this is her ſixt moneth*; or the *ſixt moneth to her.*

I. **Few** hearers **are of ſo** leaden **vnderſtanding, which hearing this** Storie read, **will not con-**

e *Acts* 13.15. & 15.21.

f *Luke* 1.36. In the Goſpel of the Anunciation.

conceiue, that Elizabeth, and not the moneth is here termed barren. Wherefore you doe but trifle about words: especially considering that your first correction; this is her sixt moneth (which is also extant in our Church Bibles,) makes the sentence neuer the lesse subiect to caption, if a man list to straine at a gnat: And your latt remendation (This is the sixt moneth to her) though smelling of the Greeke phrase, yet will neuer agree to our English Idiome.

N. Secondly, in *Luke*, you omit these words. g *After these things*, whereby *the coherence* of the *text*, and *Chronologie* is declared.

g *Luke* 10.1. In the Gospell on Saint *Lukes* day.

I. When wee reade the Chapter wee omit not these words. But when wee reade the Gospel; the coherence you pretend is not so needfull, but that it may be omitted: As for any particular Chronologie out of these wordes, it is hard to be gathered.

N. You haue not a little erred in *cutting the Bible* into these *Epistles* & *Gospels* which are more like to *shreds* and *fragments* then to *true Chapters*.

I. Forasmuch as the whole Bookes could not bee read at once, it was thought fit, (besides the Diuision into Chapters) to extract certaine smaller Models, (yet containing whole matters) that the people might bee instructed more plentifully by the reading of the text. And herein you nod your head at the Primitiue Antiquitie.

N.

N. In the *Epistle* to the h *Colossians* you geld these words, *Holy* and *beloued.*

I. You are not vnlike Cham, who (according to the table of the Hebrewes) made his Father vnapt for generation. So would you make your Mother the Church vnfit for the regeneration of men: for that watching much, she winked once, and let slip a brace of words: the Emphasis whereof she retaines notwithstanding in the Sentence. For they which put on the bowels of pitie, as the elect of God, are they not Holy and Beloued?

N. You haue added also *sentences* and *words:* The first *sentence* is in i *Matthew:* where you adde these words, *And said, Damosell arise.*

I. Beza tels you that some copies did insert these words out of Saint k Luke: it may be also out of l Saint Marke.

N. *Two other sentences* are added by you in *Luke.* The *first* in the *Storie* of the m *richman:* (*And no man gaue vnto him.*)

I. It may bee those words, were taken out of the Parable of the Prodigall n childe: Or else in some Copies they were put in by Consequence of the Storie: For it is more then probable: that no man gaue any thing to that poore Eleazar (or Lazarus) whom God, and not o man helped.

N. The *next sentence* added in p *Luke* is this: *Thou wouldest take heed.*

I. Beza doth out of Budæus tell you: That this

h *Col.* 3. 12. In the fift Sunday after the *Epiphanie.*

i *Math* 9 25. In the Gospell on the 24. Sunday after Trinitie.

k *Luke* 8.54.

l *Marke* 5.41.

m *Luke* 16.21. In the Gospell on the first Sunday after Trinitie.

n *Luke* 15.16.

o So answeres *Junius* in his Paralells vpon *Heb.* 11.21.

p *Luke* 19.42. In the Gospell on the tenth Sunday after Trinitie.

this pathetical exclamation, hath in it a defectiue breuitie, which may fitly bee supplied or explained by this, or the like sentence: which libertie of supplying, who so grants not to all translaters shall shew himselfe more stiffe in opinion, then studious for edification.

N. The *words* by you *inserted*, are partly in the *Old*, partly in the *New Testament*. And here we cannot but maruell: that you call q *Prophecies Epistles*.

I. This we doe for two causes. First, in regard of the matter of these Chapters: which is Euangelicall, and Hortatorie, not vnlike that which is found in the Epistles: Secondly, in regard of the forme: for these being among the Epistles, receiue their common name. So we say: the Psalmes of Dauid, though Dauid made not all of them: so we reckon the words of r Agur, and of s Bathsheba; among the Prouerbs of Salomon: So Saint Luke stileth his second Booke, The Acts of the Apostles; though other mens actions besides the Apostles, be there historified.

N. The *first word* added by you in the *Olde Testament*, is found in t *Isaiah*: where you haue patched the *text* with this word *Israel*; whereas the *place* is meant of *God*, as is plaine by the *context*.

I. Not so plaine (as you pretend.) The wordes are intricate in the u Hebrew, neither will there bee any incongruitie in the sense, if we

q As *Isaiah* 40 & 55. & 63. *Ier.* 23. *Ioel* 2. *Apoc.* 14. and the like.

r *Prou.* 30. 1.
s *Prou.* 31. 1.

t *Isaiah* 63. 11. In the Epistle, on the Munday before Easter.

u As may appeare by *Iunius* his confused translation of this place.

we ſay that Iſrael remembred the dayes of old: and ſo God in mercie remembred his penitent people Iſrael: Surely though I were of Domitians minde. I ſhould bee wearie of killing theſe little flies.

N. Secondly, you adde in x *Ieremie* theſe words, (*with wiſdome.*)

I. The Hebrew word ſignifieth elſewhere to proſper with y wiſdome.

N. The place in the *New Teſtament* is in the *Epiſtle* of *Paul to the* z *Galatians*: where you adde his word *naturall*.

I. Why are not wee the naturall ſonnes of God, by faith?

N. *Chriſt* only is Gods Sonne by *nature*, wee by *adoption*.

I. Saint Paul calleth Timothy, his naturall ſonne in the a faith.

N. He meaneth that he *loued him* in manner as a *naturall ſonne*.

I. So God (though in an other degree) loueth vs, as he doth his Sonne Chriſt: Can you tell what Coyne is ſhaken by this winde?

N. In the *qualitie*, there is *obſcuritie* and *falſhood*: *Obſcuritie* comes by *tranſpoſing*, or *miſinterpretation of words*. Of the *former*, the *firſt inſtance* is in b *Matthew*, where you reade *whom they bought of the Children of Iſrael*: whereas it ſhould bee rendred: *whom they of the Children of Iſrael bought* or (rather) *valued*.

I. If they valued, they bought by conſequence.

As

x *Ier.*23.5. in the Epiſtle on the 25. Sunday after Trinitie.

y 1. *Sam.*18. 14. & 30.

z *Gal.*4.5. In the Epiſtle on Sunday after Chriſtmas day.

a 1. *Tim.*1.2.

b *Math.*27.9. In the Goſpel on Sunday before Eaſter.

As for the obscurity it is in the Greeke aswell as in our English. The like Phrase is found in the [c] Acts: for there is a [d] word in both places understood.

N. A *second instance* is in the *Gospell* of [e] *John*: where you read: & *God was the word* whereas the words should thus bee placed. *And the word was God:* as both the *Greeke* [f] *Article* sheweth, which declareth the *subiect* (as you terme it) not the [g] *predicate:* As also the *sense* and *scope* of the *place* doth *convince:* For it is as improper and indirect a *speech* to say, *God* is the *word* or *Christ*, as if one should say a *liuing creature is a man*; or *a Tree is an Oake.*

I. Ramus did indeed exclude indirect predication out of his new inuented Logique, as hee did also many other most wholsome things: (Namely, the doctrine of Obiectum, Modalis propositio, Limitatio, Distinctio: Reductio Syllogismi, Figurarum modi.) Besides he most negligently handled Relation, Definition, Demonstration, [h] Method. Euerie Logician can tell you, that indirect predication is vsuall: for here it is vsed by Saint Iohn in the [i] originall. What doe you make words of Scripture like Complementall Pharisees striuing for places? Besides if a man should examine you, Cuius est hæc prædicatio (This word was God.) Could you answere? It is not Generis de Specie? Speciei de Indiuiduo? Nor Differentiæ de Specie? Much lesse Proprij or Accidentis de Specie, seu Subiecto.

c *Acts* 21.16.
d *ὄντινα*, or the like.
e *Iohn* 1.1. In the Gospell on Christmas day as you call it.
f (*ὁ*)
g *Ramus* doth terme these *antecedens & consequens.*
h See more in *Keckermans* Booke, called *Præcognita.*
i *καὶ Θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.*

N.

N. We haue hiſſed the *Predicables* out of *Logique.*

I. **You may depart out of the** Schooles **with them for company: For without the** Predicables, Diuiſion, Definition, **and** Demonſtration **cannot be vnderſtood.**

N. *Obſcuritie* by miſinterpretation of words is found in that place of the *Epiſtle to the* [k] *Galatians:* where you tranſlate *bordereth* for *anſwereth.*

k *Gal.* 4. 25. In the Epiſtle on the fourth Sunday in Lent.

I. **Doe you meane that it anſwereth in** neereneſſe **of** ſituation?

N. Nothing leſſe: For there is a *great diſtance* betweene Mount *Sinai*, and *Ieruſalem.* Wee meane it anſwereth in *allegoricall proportion.*

I. **The ſame doe wee meane by** bordering, **Namely, not** Locall, **but** Relatiue, **or** contrarie.

N. Other *obſcure places* **are in the** Epiſtle to the *Epheſians.* **The** [l] *firſt* is, where you reade, *which is father of all that is called father*; whereas the words ſhould thus be turned, *Of whom is named euery family.*

l *Ephes* 3. 5. In the Epiſtle on the 16. Sunday after Trinitie.

I. **You are not vnlike one who would haue had** Stripling **put in for** Youth **in the** [m] Pſalme. **For tell me: Is there not in** euery family **a father? Is not he** our father **of whom we receiue** our name? **Beſides the** [n] Greeke word **there vſed, ſignifieth** a company of men, **who haue** their pedigree from one Father (**as the** Iſraelites **from** Iſrael; **the** Rechabites **from** Rechab,

m *Pſal.* 119. 9.

n πατρία.

and the like.) Is not this all one with a family?

o *Ephes.* 5, 13. In the Epistle on the third Sunday in Lent.

N. The *second place* in the o *Ephesians* is: where you reade, *euery thing that is manifest, the same is light.* Whereas it should bee; *euery thing that makes manifest is light.*

p φανερούμενα.

I. Beza declares out of the Greeke Scholiast, that the Greeke word may bee rendred as wee doe it: for it is passiuely taken in the words going p before: So that by light we vnderstand full of light. In which sence the word is vsed in the same q Chapter.

q *Ephes.* 5. 8.

N. After the *obscuritie* there remaines *falshood:* violating the *analogie* either of *faith*, or of the *place*: Of the first kinde some transgresse the *Law*, some the *Gospell.* For the *Law* first you mistake the *ceremoniall*; when in the *Epistle* to the r *Hebrewes* you reade *with strange bloud*, for with *other bloud*, namely with the *bloud of beasts*, not *his owne.*

r *Heb.* 9. 25. In the Epistle on Wednesday before *Easter.*

I. When you say in the first Commandement, Thou shalt haue no other Gods but me. Doe you not meane Strange Gods? when Salomon bids you beware of a strange woman, doth he not vnderstand another woman besides your owne wife?

N. Secondly, you corrupt the *Morall Law*, when you reade in the *Epistle* to the s *Romanes*: *Apply your selues to the time*, for *seruing the Lord.* For if it should bee translated *time*; it should bee thus rendred, *seruing the time*, as if

s *Rom.* 12. 11. In the the Epistle on the second Sunday after the *Epiphanie.*

Paul

Paul ſhould ſay *be time ſeruers*, which is a thing againſt the *Morall Law*.

I. Some Greeke Copies reade as we [t] doe. The meaning of the Apoſtle may be: that we ſhould apply our ſelues to the ſeaſon, namely, to take all occaſions of doing good. So the Prophet ſpeaketh of himſelfe, according to your [u] tranſlation. So the Apoſtle enioyneth [x] vs: your obiection of ſeruing the time, is light: for we may ſerue the time, as wee may ſerue men: that is, in [y] loue, not vpon [z] conſtraint.

t καίρῳ not κυρίῳ.

u *Pſal.*75.2.

x *Gal.*6.10.

y *Gal.*5.13.

z 1.*Cor.*7.23.

N. From the *Law* to the *Goſpel*; which you firſt breake, reading in [a] *Luke*, *Lowlineſſe* for *Low Degree*.

a *Luke* 1.48. In the *Magnificat*.

I. Some would conteſt with you in this point, ſaying, that Lowlineſſe ſignifies meaneſſe, and baſeneſſe, aſwell as humilitie. But put the caſe wee had tranſlated it humilitie.

N. You had confirmed the *Popiſh errour of Merit*.

I. Why had not God reſpect to the ſacrifice and faith of [b] Abel? will not God reward vs according to the things wee haue [c] done? and that with a reward of [d] Iuſtice? to the recompence of which reward Moſes had [e] reſpect.

b *Gen.*4.4 & *Heb.*11.4.
c 2.*Cor.*5.10.
d 2.*Tim.*4.8.
e *Heb.*11.26.

N. Secondly, you doe iniurie to the *Goſpel*, when you make *Paul* doubt of his owne *ſalnation*, tranſlating [f] *a Caſt-away*, for *reproueable*.

f 1.*Cor* 9.27. In the Epiſtle on *Septuageſima* Sunday.

I. Firſt, it was poſſible that Saint Paul, being

being made of flesh aswell as of spirit; might doubt of his owne saluation: Secondly, it is lawfull for vs to feare damnation, in regard of the cause thereof, namely, sinne: For it is no seruile feare, to feare to sinne, least we be damned vpon God's pleasures against vs for sinne. As for your interpretation of reproueable, it is not worth the reproving, it is so weake.

N. There remaine *two places* against the *analogie* of the *text* or *present place*: The first is in the *Epistle* to the g *Philipians*, where you translate *apparell* for *habit*.

g *Philip.* 2. 7. In the Epistle on the Sunday next before Easter.

I. Is not habit an apparell in the tenth Categorie?

N. Wee haue banished all *Categories* out of *Logique*, and *Metaphysiques*.

I. You are not vnlike the snake, which being brought vp by an husbandman, kild one of his children. For you being nourished in the Vniuersitie, would wound or slay two of her best children, Logique and Metaphysique. But to defer this to a time more conuenient: what meane you by habit?

N. What, but the *flesh* of *Christ*?

I. Doth not Antiquitie resemble Christ's flesh to Elias h cloake? Besides, may not this be the meaning, that Christ put on the apparell of man, which was not giuen to *Adam* till after his fall?

h 2. *Kings* 2. 13

N. The *second place* is in *Peter*, i where you reade *was once looked for*, instead of *did waite*.

i 1. *Pet.* 3. 20. In the Epistle on Easter Euen

I. The

I. The Greeke word is of the meane voice; and so may signifie either.

N. But in this place, it must bee rendred *did waite*: for the *wicked* did rather *abuse* then *waite for God's mercie*. *Noah* did *expect* the *floud*.

I. Withall hee did expect the deliverance of his family; and so did prepare the Arke. Thus your words haue beene weighed, as the words of Euripides, in the scales of the [k] Poet; or rather in the Scales of Balthazar, and haue beene found too light.

k *Aristophanes* in the Frogs.

FINIS.

Let theſe faults be thus corrected, and the reſt (as miſpointing, &c.) *fauourably pardoned.*

Errata.

IN *Epiſt.* p.2.l.22.r.*readers* for *reader*, in *Epiſt.* p.4.l.23. for *Rits*, r.*Rites*. *In the ſecond Epitaph*, l.18. *ſome Copies haue beene printed Patrum* for *Patrem* p.2.l.20 r.*καίρος*. And, *ibid.* l.23. r. *Care*. And, *ibid.* in *Marg.* r.*Ioh Epiſt.2.v.*10. pag.7.l.26. r.*Cathedrall*, pag.10. *In the ſecond Marg. quotat.* for *Iohn* 18.12. r. *Matthew* 13.2. pag.12.l.31. r.*Noueliſt*, pag.15.l 25. *all* for *ill*, pag.17. l.16.r. *Theſe for thus*, pag.33.l. *the laſt before though* adde *and*, p.36. l.21.*and*31. r. *ſuperſtition*, p.41.l.14.r.*refuteth*, p.99.l.23. *for of* r. *on*, p.157. *after, enter*, adde, *into you*, p.228.l.13.r. *vegetatiue*, p 237.l.12.r. *yea & ibid* l.27. *for by*, r.*be* p.251.l.30. r. *yet* p.257.l. 11. *before ſable*, adde *a* p.266.l.28.r. *Archimedes*, p.270.l.8. adde, *with* p.286.l.11. *for alone*, r.*all-one*, *and* ibid.l.14. *for decres*, r. *decrees*.

BRITISH MUSEUM